GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

Case Nos.

CG INVESTMENT CO.

00-39 MA

and

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

00-36 CP

Thursday
April 5, 2001

Hearing Room 220 South 441 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

The Public Hearing of Case Nos. 00-39 MA and 00-36 CP by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 7:00 p.m., Carol J. Mitten, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN Chairperson
ANTHONY J. HOOD Vice Chairperson
KWASI HOLMAN Commissioner
JOHN G. PARSONS Commissioner

COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:

Alberto P. Bastida, Secretary, ZC Gerald Forsburg, Office of Zoning

OTHER AGENCY STAFF PRESENT:

John Fondersmith, Office of Planning Julie Wagner, Office of Planning

D.C. OFFICE OF CORPORATION COUNSEL:

Alan Bergstein, Esq. Mary Nagelhout, Esq.

I-N-D-E-X

| | PAGE | NO. |
|--|------|---|
| Preliminary Matters | | 4 |
| Presentation of Applicant's Case | | . 14 |
| Presentation of the Citizen's Associations Robert Elliot | | . 46 . 56 . 61 . 69 |
| Questions from the Zoning Commission Witnesses in Opposition | | . 82 |
| Tonya Hamilton Michael Hurst Jane Khoury John Cristaldi Andrew Harris Manuel Fernandez Wes Egan Dennis Paul Heather Jean Charles Hamilton | | 141 148 151 166 171 178 191 |

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(7:01 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good evening, gentlemen. This is a public hearing of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia for Thursday, April 5th, 2001. My name is Carol Mitten. Joining me this evening are Vice Chairman Anthony Hood and Commissioner Kwasi Holman.

Notice of today's hearing was published in the D.C. Register on February 9th, 2001, and in The Washington Times on February 3rd, 2001. This hearing will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR •3020.

The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning Commission Case No. 00-39 MA, a map amendment at Massachusetts Avenue between Fifth and Sixth Streets, N.W., from HR SP-2 to DD C2-C. The order of procedure will be as follows: preliminary matters, applicant's case, report of the Office of Planning, report of other agencies, report of the Advisory Neighborhood Commission, which is 2C, parties and persons in support, parties and persons in opposition regarded by the applicant.

All persons appearing before the Commission are to fill out two witness cards. These

1 cards are located at each end of the table in front of 2 Upon coming forward to speak to the Commission, 3 please give both cards to the reporter sitting to my 4 right. 5 The decision of the Commission in this case must be based exclusively on the public record. 6 7 appearance To avoid any to the contrary, the Commission requests that persons present not engage 8

10 any recess or at any time.

The staff will be available to discuss procedural questions. Please turn off all beepers and cell phones at this time, so as not to disrupt these proceedings. At this time, the Commission will consider any preliminary matters.

the members of the Commission in conversation during

15 16

9

11

12

13

14

Mr. Bastida, do we have any preliminary matters?

18

19

20

21

22

17

SECRETARY BASTIDA: Madam Yes, Chairperson. We have the affidavit of maintenance. applicant have complied with the seems to regulations regarding the maintenance affidavit. And the staff would recommend that -- that the applicant -- the applicants have satisfied the Zoning regulations.

2324

25

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Very good, thank you.

| 1 | And aside from the applicant the representatives |
|----|---|
| 2 | of the |
| 3 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair oh, |
| 4 | finish your statement. |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Aside from |
| 6 | representatives of the applicant, are there any |
| 7 | persons present in support or in opposition? I don't |
| 8 | see anyone. Mr. Hood, did you have |
| 9 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, thank you for |
| 10 | recognizing me, and excuse me for interrupting. Madam |
| 11 | Chair, I had read through the materials. I believe |
| 12 | that the record is sufficient. |
| 13 | And unless my colleagues have any |
| 14 | questions, I am ready to make a motion. |
| 15 | COMMISSIONER HOLMAN: I concur. |
| 16 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I make a motion |
| 17 | that we approve Zoning Commission Case No. 00-39 MA, |
| 18 | CG Investment Incorporated. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is there a second? |
| 20 | COMMISSIONER HOLMAN: Oh, I second. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Excellent. We have a |
| 22 | motion and a second to approve Case No. 00-39 MA. All |
| 23 | of those in favor, please say "aye". |
| 24 | ALL: Aye. |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Those opposed, please |

| 1 | say "no". |
|----|--|
| 2 | (No audible response.) |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Mr. |
| 4 | Bastida, would you record the vote? |
| 5 | SECRETARY BASTIDA: Yes, the staff would |
| 6 | record the vote three to zero, Mr. Hood moving, and |
| 7 | Mr. Holman seconding, and Ms. Mitten voting on the |
| 8 | affirmative. |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. And Mr. |
| 10 | Glasgo, will be you be providing findings of fact and |
| 11 | conclusions of law? And do you think you could have |
| 12 | those by Friday, the 13th of April? |
| 13 | MR. GLASGO: Yes. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Very good, thank you. |
| 15 | I now declare this public hearing adjourned. |
| 16 | (Whereupon, the proceedings went off the |
| 17 | record at 7:04 p.m. and resumed at 7:31 p.m.) |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good evening, ladies |
| 19 | and gentlemen. Welcome back. Tonight, April 5th, |
| 20 | 2001, we resume the public hearing of the Zoning |
| 21 | Commission for the District of Columbia for Case No. |
| 22 | 00-36 CP, the Campus Plan and three further processing |
| 23 | cases for the American University. |
| 24 | This case is being continued from February |
| 25 | 15th, February 26th, and March 15th, 2001. My name is |

1 Carol Mitten. Joining me this evening are Vice 2 Chairman Anthony Hood and Commissioners Kwasi Holman 3 and John Parsons. 4 Before we proceed this evening, I would 5 like to begin by asking that all beepers and cell 6 phones be turned off so as not to disturb this 7 I would also like to remind you not hearing. engage the Commissioners in conversation so as 8 to 9 avoid any ex parte communication. Copies of the hearing agenda are available 10 to you and are located on the table near the door. 11 12 When we adjourned the last time, we stopped just prior to the parties and opposition commencing presentation 13 of their case. Well, actually, I quess we had -- they 14 15 had begun their case. 16 Our goal is to conclude the hearing this 17 If not, we will make an assessment approximately 9:30 p.m. as to whether we can conclude, 18 19 and whether another hearing date will be scheduled. We have several preliminary matters that may affect 20 21 the manner in which we proceed this evening, so I'd 22 like to go to those at this time. Mr. Bastida?

SECRETARY BASTIDA: Yes, Madam Chairman, there are two requests for party status.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.

23

24

| _ | Commissioners, we have a request from Mr. David |
|----|--|
| 2 | Wilson, representing the Tenley Campus Neighbors |
| 3 | Association. And the reason that this request is |
| 4 | coming in at this time is because there was a problem |
| 5 | with notification; we heard about it last time. |
| 6 | And we have received some correspondence |
| 7 | on the subject having to do with the neighbors within |
| 8 | 200 feet of the Tenley Campus receiving proper notice. |
| 9 | And I believe Ms. Dwyer has no objection to Mr. |
| LO | Wilson and |
| L1 | MS. DWYER: That is correct. |
| L2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
| L3 | Commissioners, what are your thoughts about Mr. Wilson |
| L4 | being named a party in this case? |
| L5 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, do we |
| L6 | have any parties that have any objections? |
| L7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr Elliott, Mr. |
| L8 | Herzstein? |
| L9 | MR. ELLIOTT: No, of course. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: ANC representatives, |
| 21 | any objections to the I don't see them here yet. |
| 22 | MR. DiBIASE: I'm actually |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You need to come |
| 24 | forward. |
| 25 | MR. DiBIASE: Good evening, Thomas DiBiase |
| | |

| 1 | for ANC-3E, because Leslie Quynn will be joining me |
|----|--|
| 2 | shortly, but she asked me to sit in. And we have no |
| 3 | objection |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Very good. |
| 5 | MR. DiBIASE: to Mr. Wilson joining |
| 6 | this claim. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. And is |
| 8 | Ms. Hamilton here yet? Okay, I think we can we can |
| 9 | go ahead. I think the answer to your question, Mr. |
| 10 | Hood, is no. |
| 11 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, thank you, |
| 12 | Madam Chair. That was the only question I had. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I would move that Mr. |
| 14 | Wilson be named a party, representing the Tenley |
| 15 | Campus Neighbors Association. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER HOLMAN: Right, second. |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We have a motion and |
| 18 | a second to approve the Tenley Campus Neighbors |
| 19 | Association as a party in this case. All of those in |
| 20 | favor, please say "aye". |
| 21 | |
| | ALL: Aye. |
| 22 | ALL: Aye. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Those opposed, please |
| 22 | _ |
| | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Those opposed, please |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Those opposed, please say no. |

1 SECRETARY BASTIDA: The staff will record the vote four to zero, Ms. Mitten moving, Mr. Holman 2 3 seconding, Mr. Parsons and Mr. Hood voting in the affirmative. 4 5 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. And we 6 have a request by Mr. Pollock to reconsider the denial 7 of party status that -- the denial of his request for party status. We don't have anything in the rules to 8 9 provide for reconsideration. Are any of the Commissioners inclined to 10 reconsider our decision on that? 11 12 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All 13 right, any inclination? Okay, thank you. Mr. Bastida, anything 14 else? 15 16 SECRETARY BASTIDA: Yes, Madam Chairman, 17 there is a request from Mr. Elliott about same-day -same-day service. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, I think we read 20 the request by Mr. Elliott, and we read the response 21 I think you've been by Ms. Dwyer. adequately accommodated in the -- in the delivery of documents. 22 23 And I don't think there is any -- there is any need for any additional accommodation on the part of the 24 25 applicant.

| 1 | MR. ELLIOTT: Madam Chair, I concur with |
|----|---|
| 2 | your comments. |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. So, |
| 4 | you'll just proceed as you have been. Mr. Bastida, |
| 5 | anything else on preliminary matters? |
| 6 | SECRETARY BASTIDA: The staff has no other |
| 7 | preliminary matters, Madam Chairman. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Now, |
| 9 | there are a few |
| LO | MR. ELLIOTT: Madam Chair? |
| L1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, sir? |
| L2 | MR. ELLIOTT: May I? I have a preliminary |
| L3 | matter. As you may recall, Ambassador Harab was |
| L4 | confused by the clock. No one told him how it worked. |
| L5 | He meant to take four minutes. He looked up at two |
| L6 | and rising, and he thought he had a few more minutes |
| L7 | and went into lead-base paint. Is there any |
| L8 | possibility of counting that as four? |
| L9 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think that it |
| 20 | wasn't it was a number of people's responsibility |
| 21 | to maintain the time limit on your on your first |
| 22 | witness to testify. And he used nine minutes, and |
| 23 | we're going to stick with that. |
| 24 | MR. ELLIOTT: May I ask also, you had |
| 25 | offered that he could just have been a three-minute |

1 witness outside our case. Would you be willing to 2 allow, on the specific property testimony of Mr. and Mrs. Herzstein, that they make three-minute statements 3 4 in the public session? 5 Also, Mr. Duke has asked if -- he is 6 present and is one of the parties. But he has asked if he could do that as well in order to -- not to 7 infringe upon the time. 8 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Here's what -- here's 9 10 the way I would like it to work, is Mr. Herzstein and 11 his wife have been granted party status, and they are 12 functioning as parties in opposition. And they're part of your 51 minutes remaining. 13 If there's anyone else who had been part 14 15 of your case that you're going to now extract from 16 that and they're going to testify as a three-minute 17 person in opposition, that's fine. But nobody who has been given party status 18 19 personally is going to be put in another category at this time. 20 21 MR. ELLIOTT: All right. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And I would also add 22 23 that -- and I believe there's been prior conversation between the staff and the applicant -- that Mr. Wilson 24 25 is going to be given approximately ten minutes to make

1 his case. And he's not -- his time is not going to be 2 counted against the collective time that 3 already been given. 4 MR. ELLIOTT: It is not? 5 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It is not going to be 6 counted. 7 MR. ELLIOTT: Well, thank you very much. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right? And is --8 9 MR. ELLIOTT: That helps. 10 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: -- the agreement? All right, thank you. A few things that were left --11 12 left over or that came up as a result of submissions that we received; we had asked for briefs on the 1986 13 Tenley agreement, and whether or not it was within the 14 15 purview of the Zoning Commission to enforce that 16 agreement. 17 And I would ask Mr. Bergstein to speak to that at this time. 18 19 Thank you, Madam Chairman. MR. BERGSTEIN: 20 I think there are two issues. The first is assuming 21 that there was a condition and, in fact, a campus plan that would have restricted the applicant's use of its 22 23 campus, whether or not that condition would extend through, or be binding upon, this condition when it 24

reviews the campus plan that is now before it.

And I see nothing to suggest that this Commission would be so bound; that in every case where a campus plan is before the Commission, the prior conditions that were in the campus plan are open for the Commission to reconsider.

And they are not bound to continue any particular condition that's in the prior campus plan. So, whether or not there should be restrictions on the applicant's use of its campus is something for this Commission to decide at this time.

And any prior conditions that might have imposed impediments on that are not binding upon the Commission.

The other issue is what would be the effect of agreements reached between the parties concerning those same issues? And we do not believe that parties can contract away this Commission's jurisdiction to hear special exceptions.

The Commission, in hearing special exceptions, is proceeding pursuant to a statutory grant of authority. And the issue of whether or not there has been a breach of an agreement, and what its impact would be upon an applicant's ability to request special exception relief is not something that is within this Commission's authority to decide.

It would be within a Court's authority to decide. We have an applicant who believes that it is entitled to proceed with special exception requests. You have opposition parties who believe that, based upon an agreement, they are not.

That is not something that we believe is within the purview of this Commission to decide. It can decide the merits of the application, but not whether or not there is an independent, legal impediment to it doing that was reached between the parties.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. So, this evening, when we are hearing Bergstein. testimony, we will not hear testimony as the legality of the 1986 agreement because it not within the authority of this body to decide the legality.

But to the extent that you would like to speak about the merits of the case, as embodied by the 1986 agreement, please do so.

We had another -- we had submissions related to the exploring alternative sites for the Katzen Arts Center. And as it relates to the Katzen Arts Center and alternative sites for it, we would -- it's within the purview of this Commission to decide

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

17 1 the merits of what has been proposed by the applicant 2 as far as the siting of the Katzen Arts Center. If we decide that the Katzen Arts Center 3 4 is not appropriate for that site, we will not tell the 5 applicant where to place it. So, hearing testimony about the -- about the desirability of other sites is 6 7 not helpful testimony. So, if you go in that direction, I will 8 9 interrupt you and ask you to speak to the merits of the Katzen Arts Center where it has been proposed. 10 11

There is an issues that's been raised by Mr. Elliott. Just bear with me while I find my reference. This issue was raised in Citizens Association's brief in response to AU brief of March 15th, 2001, regarding selection of Cassell site.

And this is number six, "changed testimony by letter and permissible and right to cross examine."

Mr. Elliott has raised the issue that, in your brief,

Ms. Dwyer, related to the Cassell site and the -- and the -- basically using the Cassell site -- the Cassell Building envelope as a benchmark against which to measure the Katzen Arts Center -- you seem to be arguing in favor of that in your brief.

Whereas, Mr. Abud, in his testimony, specifically said it wasn't relevant. So, I need to

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 ascertain what the position of the applicant is that, and whether or not Mr. Elliott is entitled to 2 3 cross examination on your position. 4 MS. DWYER: I believe that what Mr. Abud 5 said was that in the context of this campus plan, the 6 University did not do an extensive evaluation of 7 alternative sites. What I did is just point out for 8 9 the Commission's information that, ten 10 that process by years ago, was engaged in the 11 University. 12 And at that point in time, the Cassell site was deemed an appropriate site for development of 13 this size. 14 15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think I -- maybe I 16 didn't make my point clear enough, which is -- and 17 maybe I'll just read the section of the -- of the transcript that's relevant. 18 19 Elliott asks, "Subject three, site 20 selection, can you explain on what basis you feel that 21 the Cassell Building envelope, as it's been called, is 22 proper standard for judging your replacement building, a new building at that site; I mean, the 23 general heights and position of the Cassell Building?" 24 25 And then, Mr. Abud responded, "I don't

| 1 | think there's any relationship, so I don't believe |
|----|---|
| 2 | it's a proper standard." Whereas, in your brief, |
| 3 | there's discussion about the relationship between the |
| 4 | Katzen Arts Center Building and the envelope of the |
| 5 | Cassell Building. |
| 6 | So, Mr. Elliott would like to discern what |
| 7 | your position is, because he is concerned that he |
| 8 | hasn't had adequate opportunity to cross examine on |
| 9 | what the position of the University is. |
| 10 | MS. DWYER: Well, then, what I would like |
| 11 | to do is call Jorge Abud back up and ask Mr. Elliott |
| 12 | to ask the question that he feels needs clarification |
| 13 | from Mr. Abud. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Are you prepared to |
| 15 | do that, Mr. Elliott? |
| 16 | MR. ELLIOTT: Certainly, if that's how you |
| 17 | wish to proceed. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. |
| 19 | MR. ELLIOTT: Well, first, we need to hear |
| 20 | from Mr. Abud what the University position now is on |
| 21 | this point, and then I can cross examine. Would you |
| 22 | state what the position is, Mr. Abud? |
| 23 | MR. ABUD: The position is what I |
| 24 | testified to, that the Cassell Building isn't |
| 25 | necessarily a standard by which to measure whether or |

| 1 | not a building on that site is appropriate. |
|----|--|
| 2 | It certainly is something by which people |
| 3 | who live behind it can judge whether something is |
| 4 | closer or higher. The building has been there for |
| 5 | more than 50 years, and people have gotten used to it. |
| 6 | So, I think, in that respect, it's often |
| 7 | used as a point of comparison. But I don't think that |
| 8 | it means that any new development that's proposed |
| 9 | there ought to fit within the envelope, or within the |
| 10 | height of that existing building, or that you know, |
| 11 | that it really is relevant, beyond just a general way |
| 12 | to be able to compare. |
| 13 | MR. ELLIOTT: Would it be fair to say, |
| 14 | then, that the new proposal that's before the |
| 15 | Commission should stand on its own two feet, in terms |
| 16 | of its size, mass, and whether it imposes on |
| 17 | UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Objection. |
| 18 | MR. ELLIOTT: or impacts upon |
| 19 | neighbors? |
| 20 | MR. ABUD: Yes. |
| 21 | MR. ELLIOTT: And are you also, at this |
| 22 | point, asserting that there is some relevance to the |
| 23 | size, mass, height and envelope of the law school |
| 24 | building in the last plan? |
| 25 | MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, I think that goes |

| 1 | beyond |
|-----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's beyond that |
| 3 | is beyond. |
| 4 | MR. ELLIOTT: All right. |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Have you got any |
| 6 | other |
| 7 | MR. ELLIOTT: That's finishes it. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: the issues that he |
| 9 | raised? |
| 10 | MR. ELLIOTT: I think he has clarified |
| 11 | I withdraw that last question. I think he has |
| 12 | clarified what his position, which is very similar to |
| 13 | last previous answer. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. |
| 15 | MR. ELLIOTT: Thank you, Madam Chair. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you for calling |
| 17 | that to our attention. All right, in reviewing the |
| 18 | summary of your case, Mr. Elliott and Herzstein, there |
| 19 | were several issues that I would like to call out that |
| 20 | I would that I think are not appropriate for us to |
| 21 | hear testimony about. |
| 22 | Number ten in your submission of March |
| 23 | 21st, which is Summary of Opponent's Evidence, which I |
| 24 | believe has to do with the legality of the private |
| ~ - | |

contracts between the University and community groups

| | and ANC-3E I chillik we covered that earlier. |
|----|---|
| 2 | But just to reiterate, we don't want |
| 3 | testimony about the legality of those. It's not |
| 4 | within our authority to enforce that. Are we clear |
| 5 | about that? |
| 6 | MR. ELLIOTT: I understand you're |
| 7 | excluding evidence on those contracts entirely. Or is |
| 8 | there |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's |
| 10 | MR. ELLIOTT: is your ruling more |
| 11 | narrow? I'm not sure. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, it's more it's |
| 13 | actually we don't want discussion about the |
| 14 | legality of it because we that's not for us to |
| 15 | determine. But earlier, specifically in reference to |
| 16 | the 1986 agreement, if there is something in that |
| 17 | agreement that bears on the merits of the campus plan |
| 18 | that's before us, we want to hear that. |
| 19 | But we but we are not going to |
| 20 | determine whether those those agreements are |
| 21 | actually in force. |
| 22 | MR. ELLIOTT: All right. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right? |
| 24 | MR. ELLIOTT: In other words, if the |
| 25 | some opponents believe they are, they can explain how |
| | |

1 that affects -- but they're not going to argue the 2 merits of whether the contract means this or that. Ι 3 think I understand. 4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. And then, in 5 in your discussion about number 11, the proposed 6 parking plan that would be similar to Mount Vernon 7 Campus, you make reference to the fact that you want the program to cover law students. 8 9 And we don't have the jurisdiction, in the 10 context of this campus plan, over the law students. 11 So, we don't want to hear testimony about something 12 over which we don't have jurisdiction at this time. MR. ELLIOTT: May I be heard on that? 13 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Briefly. 14 15 MR. ELLIOTT: All right. The law students 16 use the main campus. And to that extent, it seems to 17 me there's enough nexus between them -- their many uses of the campus, and the fact that some of them 18 19 park there and they take buses and so forth. There's 20 a single transportation system here. 21 So, I think that that would give you jurisdiction to deal with the use of this campus. 22 The so close that you could sweep the 23 students' parking into the overall parking condition. 24 25 That's our position.

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And I understand |
|----|---|
| 2 | that, and I guess I would like you to be a little |
| 3 | creative about the way you present that so that you |
| 4 | speak more to the students who park on the campus, as |
| 5 | opposed to where they are where they're being |
| 6 | educated or how they're being educated. |
| 7 | I think the point is that they're parking |
| 8 | on campus. You want them captured. So, it doesn't |
| 9 | matter that they're law students. So, let's just not |
| 10 | let's not let's not discuss them as law |
| 11 | students. Let's discuss them as students who park on |
| 12 | campus. Is that fair? |
| 13 | MR. ELLIOTT: I think so. And you've |
| 14 | already heard testimony about students who park off- |
| 15 | campus without knowing who's who. So, that's a |
| 16 | general problem as well. |
| 17 | Incidently, Mr. Ruttenburg wishes to |
| 18 | present to you the idea that you should expand the |
| 19 | campus to include the law school property. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, and he can do |
| 21 | that when it's |
| 22 | MR. ELLIOTT: He will. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: when it's his |
| 24 | turn. And then, under your discussion about further |
| 25 | processing, and you you make some reference to the |

| 1 | relative merits of the Nebraska Avenue parking lot as |
|----|---|
| 2 | a possible site for the Katzen Arts Center, as I |
| 3 | mentioned earlier, that's not going to be productive |
| 4 | testimony for us. All right? |
| 5 | MR. ELLIOTT: The selection of the |
| 6 | Nebraska lot, you're excluding the testimony |
| 7 | evidence on that? |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right, but you had |
| 9 | you had some good points in the beginning, as they |
| 10 | relate to the Katzen Arts Center Building on the site |
| 11 | where it's proposed. And we would like to hear that. |
| 12 | We just don't want to hear testimony about where else |
| 13 | it might go. All right? |
| 14 | MR. ELLIOTT: I don't know if I quite |
| 15 | follow that. You want us to critique the lot where |
| 16 | they are siting it |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Exactly. |
| 18 | MR. ELLIOTT: without reference to the |
| 19 | fact that there might be less impacts on another lot? |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Correct. They |
| 21 | haven't proposed it for another place. Just deal with |
| 22 | it where it has been proposed. |
| 23 | MR. ELLIOTT: Is that also a ruling with |
| 24 | respect to the campus plan application? In other |
| 25 | words, you do not hear evidence about the site |

| 1 | selection in the campus plan? I can understand |
|--|---|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What do you |
| 3 | MR. ELLIOTT: the further processing |
| 4 | more. But as to the campus plan, it seems to me |
| 5 | that's at the heart of it to figure out which |
| 6 | facilities go where. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, unfortunately, |
| 8 | what we do is we vote what the University has proposed |
| 9 | up or down. We don't shuffle the pieces on the board. |
| 10 | And to the extent that they need to be shuffled, |
| 11 | we'll we'll tell the University, "Your |
| 12 | configuration doesn't work." |
| 13 | MR. ELLIOTT: Okay. |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And they'll have to |
| 15 | reshuffle them. We won't do that for them. |
| | |
| 16 | MR. ELLIOTT: I see. |
| 16 17 | |
| | MR. ELLIOTT: I see. |
| 17 | MR. ELLIOTT: I see. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, talking about |
| 17 18 | MR. ELLIOTT: I see. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, talking about better places to put things isn't going to be |
| 17 18 19 | MR. ELLIOTT: I see. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, talking about better places to put things isn't going to be productive for the Zoning Commission. |
| 17 18 19 20 | MR. ELLIOTT: I see. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, talking about better places to put things isn't going to be productive for the Zoning Commission. MR. ELLIOTT: I understand. If I |
| 17 18 19 20 21 | MR. ELLIOTT: I see. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, talking about better places to put things isn't going to be productive for the Zoning Commission. MR. ELLIOTT: I understand. If I understand what you're saying, if you're not satisfied |
| 17 18 19 20 21 22 | MR. ELLIOTT: I see. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, talking about better places to put things isn't going to be productive for the Zoning Commission. MR. ELLIOTT: I understand. If I understand what you're saying, if you're not satisfied with either application, you can tell the applicant, |
| 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MR. ELLIOTT: I see. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, talking about better places to put things isn't going to be productive for the Zoning Commission. MR. ELLIOTT: I understand. If I understand what you're saying, if you're not satisfied with either application, you can tell the applicant, "Go work on it, come back." |

27 1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. 2 MR. ELLIOTT: All right. 3 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right? And then, 4 Mr. Bergstein, in your summary, there was a fair 5 amount of discussion about directing the parties to 6 return to a negotiating posture. And again, we would like to hear testimony about the merits of the case. 7 If we get to the point where we can't 8 9 reach agreement, and it's desirable to send someone 10 back to the drawing board, then the University is --11 knows where you are. And to the extent that they want 12 to negotiate, then they will. But it's not going to be the posture of 13 this Commission -- we have a -- we have a decision --14 15 we're collecting information through these hearings, 16 and we will deliberate. And to the extent that we can 17 make a decision without further information, we will do that. 18 19 MR. HERZSTEIN: I understand that, Madam 20 I was taking my cue from the very important 21 and ultimately successful experience that we had in 1987 to '89. As you know, at that time, the Board of 22 Zoning Adjustment took that approach. 23

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

attention as an option. But obviously --

And we simply wanted to call that to your

24

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. HERZSTEIN: it's up to you to |
| 3 | decide what to do. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right, and and we |
| 5 | understand that that's an option. But I guess in |
| 6 | terms of the time that you'll spend testifying this |
| 7 | evening, I think it's better spent on the merits of |
| 8 | the case, as opposed to the merits of going back of |
| 9 | sending you back to negotiate. We know that |
| 10 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Okay. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: that's an option. |
| 12 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Thank you. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Is there |
| 14 | anyone planning to testify this evening that has not |
| 15 | been sworn at any of the previous three hearings? |
| 16 | Please stand to take (sic) the oath, Mr. Bastida. |
| 17 | SECRETARY BASTIDA: (Administers oath.) |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'd like to remind |
| 19 | you that all persons planning to testify need to fill |
| 20 | out two witness cards that are on the tables in front |
| 21 | of us. And you should hand the cards to the reporter |
| 22 | upon coming forward to testify. |
| 23 | And let me remind you of the time limits |
| 24 | going forward. The parties in opposition, as |
| 25 | represented by Mr. Elliott and Mr. Herzstein, have 51 |

| 1 | minutes remaining to present their case. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Then, Mr. David Wilson, representing the |
| 3 | Tenley Campus Neighbors Association, will have ten |
| 4 | minutes, as a party in opposition. Persons in |
| 5 | opposition have three minutes each. |
| 6 | There is a sign-up sheet in the back of |
| 7 | the room. There is a door in which those persons who |
| 8 | will testify in opposition can place their names. |
| 9 | Signing up will help us proceed through the individual |
| 10 | testimony in an orderly manner. |
| 11 | Now, I believe there is one thing |
| 12 | remaining. There was I believe, Ms. Dwyer, you are |
| 13 | making your witnesses available to Mr. Wilson for |
| 14 | cross examination this evening? |
| 15 | MS. DWYER: Yes. In the interest of |
| 16 | ensuring that we have a complete record, we have our |
| 17 | witnesses here. If Mr. Wilson have questions about |
| 18 | the Tenley Campus, the witnesses are here to be cross |
| 19 | examined by him. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 21 | MR. WILSON: Ms. Mitten? |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You need to come |
| 23 | forward, Mr. Wilson. |
| 24 | MR. WILSON: I am David Wilson, and I just |
| 25 | wonder what the order of things is going to be |

1 tonight. Would we -- are we going to do the --2 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'd like you to begin 3 with cross examination of the applicant's 4 witnesses if you're prepared to do that. 5 MR. WILSON: Okay. I need to go to my car 6 and get one thing. So, it may be better if the 7 opponents can go first. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. So, we'll 8 9 -- we will allow Mr. Elliott and Mr. Herzstein to 10 continue -- to complete their presentation. And then, you'll come up, and you'll do the cross examination, 11 12 and then present your --MR. WILSON: Okay, thank you. 13 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: -- your case. 14 15 MR. WILSON: And another preliminary 16 matter is that we move that the -- so much of the 17 campus plan application, as it pertains to the Tenley Campus, be remanded to the University on the grounds 18 19 that they have failed to satisfy the burden of 20 demonstrating that this campus plan, far as 21 Tenley Campus, would pertains to the not raise objectionable conditions for the neighborhood. 22 23 This is a seriously vague plan. extent it is specific, it is seriously flawed. 24 It is 25 a plan that would increase, by over 200 percent, the

1 number of parking spaces and --2 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'd rather I'd 3 prefer that you not argue your case right now. 4 MR. WILSON: Well, I'm making a motion. 5 And if you don't want to hear argument on it, that's But I make the motion because I think on the 6 basis of reviewing the transcripts and of looking at 7 the plan, I find no support for carrying the burden 8 9 that is the University's burden to show that this plan raise objectionable conditions for 10 would not 11 neighborhood. 12 There has been no neighborhood input in the -- on this. It's sure to raise objectionable 13 conditions. 14 15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Ms. Dwyer? 16 MS. DWYER: To the extent that Mr. Wilson 17 has substantive objections, they can do that as part of their testimony. I think the record is very clear 18 19 in what we filed, that the community surrounding the Tenley Campus has been involved in this process from 20 21 the beginning. 22 What we filed in the record were copies of 23 chronology of meetings that have taken place between the University and the community beginning in 24 25 January of 2000.

1 A representative of ANC-3E, which includes 2 the Tenley neighbors, as well as a representative of the AU Park Citizen Association, participated in all 3 4 of those meetings. 5 When the Office of Planning suggested 6 facilitation, Leslie Quynn, who is the ANC-3E 7 representative, participated in that process. To the that these particular 8 extent 9 neighbors were not advised by their ANC representative 10 or the AU Park representative of the Tenley Campus 11 proposal, or did not attend the many community 12 meetings, that is not any fault of the applicant. The University went out of its way to be 13 14 inclusive and make to sure every community 15 organization was part of this process. 16 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: If I may just respond 17 to the motion, one of the things that the Commission will rule on is whether, in fact, after -- after we 18 19 hear all the testimony, whether the University has met 20 its burden of proof. 21 So, I think we'd like to take your motion under advisement, and that will be among the things 22 23 that we deliberate and rule on ultimately. 24 MR. WILSON: I was just trying to save 25 some time because --

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand. You need to speak into the microphone.

MR. WILSON: I was simply trying to save time because I don't believe they've carried their burden. And I think it's appropriate to just send it back to them.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand, thank you.

MR. DiBIASE: I wonder, Madam Chair, if I may make a point on behalf of ANC-3E, because my understanding is this came up at the last hearing. And that is sort of the idea that ANC-3E represents -- simply because someone lives in that neighborhood, or an organization of people, a group of people, live in that neighborhood, that ANC must -- ANC-3E must represent all of those viewpoints.

And I want to be very clear that that is not -- that's certainly not the ANC's position. We have to represent everyone in ANC-3E. And as you know, simple practicalities, that must mean that some viewpoints are necessarily excluded because we don't agree with them or because they represent, you know perhaps a minority view, and the best example being that certainly people within 200 feet of the Tenley Campus would have one view of a plan, whereas people

who live two or three blocks away would have a probably very different view.

So, I just want to be clear that, from the ANC's position, we don't necessarily represent the specific view of the -- of the group of neighbors that Mr. Wilson represents.

So, it's not -- it's not fair to simply say that because 3E, specifically Commission Quynn and Commissioner Gordon were involved in those meetings, that therefore, the views of other smaller groups, with maybe diverging opinions, that their opinions must necessarily have been represented, or that it's incumbent upon ANC to sort of let everybody know here's what's going on.

And we have monthly meetings. We have a So, there is some communication. website. don't want it to be misconstrued that ANC-3E's participation means that other, smaller groups, or different opinions, that their viewpoints are necessarily included in what the we state Commission.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think I understand it. But all the folks that -- that are within the area that the ANC encompasses are given an opportunity to express their views in public meetings, correct?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| | MR. DIBLASE: Yes, now, I think now, |
|----|--|
| 2 | with the granting of this group, specifically, as |
| 3 | party status but whether that means that because |
| 4 | the notification provisions, I think admittedly here, |
| 5 | were not were not followed for some reason, or were |
| 6 | not noticed proper notice was not given, I don't |
| 7 | think the University can say, "Well, it doesn't really |
| 8 | matter because ANC-3E was at the meeting, and all of |
| 9 | these people live in 3E." |
| 10 | My point is merely that people with a |
| 11 | different opinion or a divergent opinion from what the |
| 12 | ANC ultimately comes to in a vote at a public meeting, |
| 13 | that their viewpoints may never have been represented |
| 14 | to us, or maybe have never been made known to us. So, |
| 15 | I |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think I understand. |
| 17 | MR. DiBIASE: All right. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. We're |
| 19 | going to speak into the mic. |
| 20 | MR. WILSON: I'll make it very brief. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sure. |
| 22 | MR. WILSON: We didn't have notice from |
| 23 | the ANC either. And I think it may have been a |
| 24 | function of the fact that the Chair of the ANC turned |
| 25 | over. Ms. Quynn, as I understand it, just became |

| 1 | Chair of the ANC. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Nobody in our neighborhood had notice |
| 3 | under for any of this. So |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But there's a normal |
| 5 | procedure for giving people notice of ANC meetings. |
| 6 | And are you saying that that normal procedure was not |
| 7 | followed? |
| 8 | MR. WILSON: I never got notice of an ANC |
| 9 | meeting. |
| 10 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me just |
| 11 | interject, Madam Chair, if I can. There are a number |
| 12 | of ways in which the new legislation on how to get the |
| 13 | word out to community folks is performed by the City |
| 14 | Council. |
| 15 | One of them is it has to be placed in two |
| 16 | conspicuous areas that's heavily traveled. That may |
| 17 | have been done. It's not necessarily guaranteed that |
| 18 | you're going to get one on your doorstep. |
| 19 | So, I'm not saying they did or didn't. |
| 20 | But there are a number of ways of which the community |
| 21 | can be notified. |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
| 23 | MS. DWYER: And Madam Chair, the only |
| 24 | thing I wanted to make clear for the record, whether |
| 25 | or not this particular group of neighbors did in |

1 fact, have notice, it was not through any fault of the 2 University. The University has been communicating with 3 4 these groups. It had the working group meetings. 5 attended the ANC meetings last spring. This has been 6 in the Northwest Current, in all of the newspapers. 7 applicant posted the property The provided staff with the correct list of names. 8 So, I 9 just want the record to be clear --10 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. 11 MS. DWYER: -- that the University did 12 what was required and beyond. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right, thank you. 13 MR. RUTTENBURG: Madam Chairman? 14 15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sir, if you have 16 something to say that's relevant to this particular matter, please come forward, and identify yourself for 17 the record. 18 19 MR. RUTTENBURG: is Charles My name 20 I'm President of the American University 21 Park Citizens Association. Ms. Dwyer said something about AU Park representing these folks. We do not. 22 23 Tenley has never been a part American University Park Citizens Association. So, we 24 25 had no way of notifying them.

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, thank you. I |
|----|--|
| 2 | don't know how Mr. Elliott and Mr. Herzstein, I |
| 3 | don't know how you plan to present the balance of your |
| 4 | case. But whenever you're ready, please proceed. |
| 5 | MS. DWYER: Madam Chair, if I could just |
| 6 | make one other comment? In looking through the |
| 7 | materials that we just received from Mr. Elliott, |
| 8 | there are a number of exhibits that relate to issues |
| 9 | that you have said are not going to be before the |
| 10 | Commission tonight concerning the legality of the two |
| 11 | agreements. |
| 12 | And I would just like to have the |
| 13 | opportunity after tonight's hearing to review those |
| 14 | and to see whether some of these exhibits should be |
| 15 | excluded from the record. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
| 17 | MS. DWYER: Thank you. |
| 18 | MR. ELLIOTT: We're ready, Madam Chair. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anytime. |
| 20 | MR. ELLIOTT: All right. Madam Chair and |
| 21 | Members of the Commission, I will begin briefly by |
| 22 | and as Mr. Hood said at our last hearing, the Members |
| 23 | of this Commission do their homework, and we've seen |
| 24 | that. |
| 25 | I have submitted my opening statement in |

writing, a letter dated March 21. I'm not going to go through everything in it. I want to, instead, go into some specific facts that I think are of concern here.

The first question is, the Zoning Commission has taken over the campus plan processing. We assume this is to take a new look at it. From the very beginning -- and it's no surprise -- I have questioned whether this is a plan. In other words, what does the Commission really want in a plan?

Is it enough to just take almost every building site on a campus and designate a future building on it, with very little guidance as to what, how, or why, or when, or in what order?

If you'll look at Chart 1 on the board here, you will see the projects left after the Arts and the two smaller projects, which University wants to build initially, and the total construction, there is 690,000 of square feet additional construction that includes Building H-170,000 conversion.

If you were to delete Building A and B as Ambassador Schaefer urged, and as we urge, because they're on the periphery of the campus, because they strongly impact the neighbors to the south, you will still have 610,000 square feet of construction

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

proposed in this plan.

And note that the University, itself, said it's not going to exceed 400,000 FAR. I've put down the number 230 FAR. With reading the testimony, I think actually you may have made a little mistake on that because Cassell is a reduction of FAR.

So, you probably would have more like 270 left after the first phase. Turn to Chart 2, please.

Next, with that large amount of construction, if you really look hard at this campus plan, you will find that the uses are very loose. They're very loosely defined. That came up in cross examination February 26th, but I want to stress this.

A building will be defined on pages 31 to 34 of the application as "this use" or "that use". And one of the buildings, the one down at Tenley, is actually just defined as "multiple uses including".

I have, therefore, taken those concepts, applied them to the buildings involved, and found that the plan allows for us to 350,000 square feet of administrative offices in this remaining site of buildings; up to 450,000 feet of faculty offices or more, because there are parts of two buildings that can be faculty offices; and up to 600,000 square feet of instructional space; and up to 150,000 square feet

of housing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It can't be all of that. This is overlap. That's what I'm trying to point out. So that the flexibility concept goes too far. And Madam Chair, if I may remind you, when you sat on the Mount Vernon Campus plan matter, by designation, there you saw a plan that actually had five phases of campus construction, and a plan that was expected to built; maybe not every bit of it, but a good part of it.

It was feasible. It was expected. It was a real plan, and it had five phases which enabled you to see how it would unfold. Turn to Chart 3, please.

I might mention, Ms. Dwyer has filed a revised land use, Exhibit 11. And we have found that two of the buildings, because of these loose uses, would be in the residential campus life part of the land use, but actually could be used for unlimited offices in one case and administrative offices in the other.

This is, again, a problem of such looseness of the definition of "use". And if you go over to the Tenley Campus, you'll find that this new land use chart happens to have that new building straddle the two zones. Next chart, please.

These charts are under Tab 2 of our book, incidently. The building use descriptions, look at This is Table 4. And I'm sorry that Mr. Franklin isn't here, but Ι think he will be particularly interested in this point because lawyers are very interested in how concepts are defined and tied down.

This plan intentionally has a whole series of overlapping and kind of odd descriptions of how buildings are used. Look at the first six there: academic office functions, then academic offices, then housing academic programs, then academic facility use, and then also classrooms and instruction.

Each one of these is different from the other, and none is defined. And then, there is, in page 31 to 34, the concept of multiple functions for a 100,000 feet at Tenley, including some certain ones. But it could be anything.

And then, finally, there are three different ways of defining administrative space, as opposed to academic, and those are: administrative support functions, but also administrative offices, and also office use.

So, I think one problem with this plan is by using such vague designations of how buildings will

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

be used, it's a blank check. Next chart, please.

I would compliment the University

I would compliment the University on trying to improve its center of its campus, eliminate a road that dips under, made the quad and central area better.

My point here is, nothing in their proposal to you ties the authority they're asking for to the concept they say they want to pursue. In other words, they have a concept; they describe it. they just let us build any say, of these buildings in any sequence or order at any There's no tie.

Similarly, they have explained in detail that they propose increased parking to accommodate an increase in the current student and faculty and staff level up 25 percent. They have put in 500 more spaces.

However, they ask for a population cap now that would permit going up 25 percent from where they are. But it doesn't tie at all to construction or to providing those parking spaces.

And similarly, they propose new housing. But again, the population that they seek has no tie to actually doing any of that housing. Next chart, please.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 And if you look back at the '89 plan 2 compared to this plan, you'll notice -- and it caught 3 my eye the first time I read this application. 4 number of their projects, they say, oh, there was a 5 project in '89 on this site. There was a project in '89 on this site. 6 7 But let's take a look at some of these projects that were there in '89 compared to now. 8 9 Project A was 25,000 feet. Now, it's 30,000 and the 10 uses have changed. Project B has a different footprint, and 11 12 the uses have changed. Project D has changed uses. Project E was 15,000 feet -- Ms. Dwyer is sure to 13 14 correct me if I'm wrong, but 15,000 feet. Now, it's 15 100,000 feet with 260 cars. 16 Project F was 50,000 feet. Now, it's 17 100,000 feet on a different adjacent site. Project G was 700 feet, and now it's 10,000 feet. 18 19 Project H was a garage, and it's turned 20 into habitable space, as we know. Project K was 21 15,000; now it's 50,000 with a garage, a different 22 footprint and greater height. 23 And of course, Project L has a different underneath, different 24 а garage and a use, and

footprint, and different heights, mass and size.

25

Next

chart, please.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I had put in the book a longer list, but here are some of the tools available to the Commission. One, eliminate projects. I think this application cries out for it.

priorities; two, set University tie what it proposes to do to carrying out its goals. It can do that with population, by keying to what the University said it needs. It says it's going have growth; it's going to to have fluctuations.

It can reduce -- you can reduce the size of buildings. You can define those uses better. For instance, a 100,000 square-foot building, you might require that not more than a certain percentage be for office. You could break up those multiple uses into some allocation; maybe not right to 100 percent, but some maximum just to get some idea what those buildings are going to be used for.

And more important, you could have real definitions of uses. These are not real definitions.

And again, I hope Commission Herb Franklin, as a trained lawyer, looks at the definitional aspect of that because all lawyers define things. That's how we do it.

| And you could tie the plan to goals, tie |
|--|
| it to the goals that AU has. Next, I'm going to call |
| Pamela Heyne, an expert who has been already qualified |
| with respect to the Arts Center, which is twice as |
| wide as a Wal-Mart or a K-Mart. I sent my assistant |
| to measure one of each. |
| Ms. Heyne, are you ready? It might become |
| known as Art-Mart. |
| (Laughter.) |
| MS. HEYNE: I'll need three easels. |
| MR. ELLIOTT: Can you stop the clock for a |
| second? |
| CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Could you stop the |
| clock, please? |
| MS. HEYNE: I think these should be seen |
| by the audience too. I think that's a way of doing it |
| both |
| MR. ELLIOTT: Can you see them from there, |
| Madam Chair? |
| CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, we can. |
| MS. HEYNE: How about Mr. Holman; you're |
| the farthest away? |
| COMMISSIONER HOLMAN: I can see perfectly. |
| MS. HEYNE: My name is Pamela Heyne. I'm |
| with the architectural firm of Houston & Heyne, |
| |

Associated Architects, in Georgetown. While I hate to admit it, I've been practicing architecture for well over 25 years. I'm a graduate of Yale School of Architecture.

I was asked to review the proposal of American University to build an Arts Center building

I was asked to review the proposal of American University to build an Arts Center building on the north side of Mass. Avenue across from the main gate of American University.

The proposal must be judged under the zoning regulations applicable to campus plans,

••210.2, the 1989, 1990 campus plan, in relation to various sections of the Ward 3 comprehensive plan.

I note •1406.9(b) of the Ward 3 comprehensive plan which states, "Relate the size and proportions of new construction to the scale of existing buildings." In other words, any new building in this area shouldn't be overly obtrusive or intrusive.

Now, one of the main problems with this building is its length. It stretches a distance of 660 feet, east to west. That does not include the sunken art gallery.

As an interesting comparison, it is 40 feet longer than the Kennedy Center. Now, of course, the Kennedy Center is rimmed by the Potomac River,

high-rise buildings, and major roads.

This building, of course, is rimmed by the special street of Massachusetts Avenue and single-family residences. Another thing to note about this building, which obviously -- perhaps it's an unfair comparison, and naturally it's bigger than these residences.

But additionally, it is much bigger than any building on campus in terms of length. It is far longer than any of the other buildings on the campus.

Now, another aspect about it that I find troubling is a certain height that seems unnecessary.

And one area that I object to tremendously is the parapet along Massachusetts Avenue. Here it is, delineated in the elevations. Here it is, also delineated by the red lines.

Now, most parapets -- most people know a parapet is a wall that sticks up above a roof. Typically, a parapet is about a foot high. This parapet is 11 feet high.

I'm not quite sure the reason for that because this is not where the mechanical equipment is. It was probably done for aesthetic reasons, whatever they may be. On the other hand, what it winds up being is an unrelieved white wall that is 200 feet

long.

Another aspect of the building, of course, apart from the height, is its bulk. Much of the bulk is a result of -- let's flip this up -- a lot of empty space, light wells, as you were. Here's a light well, another light well, another light well; light wells throughout.

And this is a very high student lounge area. Now obviously, there is certainly a need for gathering spaces and everything. But the fact that it has to have this many levels in it to create a light well, I wonder -- I think, perhaps, this could have been re-thought inasmuch as it impacts their neighbors to this extent.

This is a rear view of it, of this particular rotunda. And I did not put the Exxon sign on; however, the neighbors obviously felt they needed to do that, because obviously, that's what it looked like to them.

Now additionally, this -- the fence is 7foot-6 high, higher than the standard garden fence in
the District. And as you can see, it's a very
different appearance from the more standard, mere yard
effect here, which shows open views, a much more open
view of trees and that sort of thing.

1 Now, I want to get back to this drawing 2 because it's also illustrative of a certain 3 misleading visual information, which I 4 believe has been the case. 5 Some of the residents have complained, 6 from Ft. Gaines in particular have complained, that 7 they've only seen a study model, a rough study model. And models are typically not brought to meetings. 8 9 The building is typically shown in perspective highly fore-shortened, either from this 10 direction or from the other direction. 11 12 Additionally, these elevations do not show 13 the full height of the building. Nowhere on the 14 elevation do I see the garage, which is obviously a 15 three-lane entrance into this building. Nor does it 16 show any of the steps coming up. 17 This particular perspective drawing does show some steps. However, if you compare it to this 18 19 illustration, you will see, for instance, there are 20 one, two, three landings here. Here, we have two 21 landings. 22 Now, perhaps, this was an early phase. 23 Maybe they hadn't quite worked it out. On the other hand, I believe this building was -- this drawing was 24

same

time

this

produced

about

the

25

was

drawing

produced. So, it seems to me there should be consistency.

Also, the garage is shown with the door closed. I would suspect that much of the time, it's going to be open. I would also suspect that it is going to be highly visible from the street-scape, certainly at night.

I also wonder, just as an aside, how the handicapped will be gotten into the building. Perhaps many of them will go in that way, or perhaps -- perhaps they would come up this way. I'm not sure. That's one element of it. It's just a very minor curiosity I have about it.

Now, this particular segment of the municipal regulations, 210.2, "Uses of college universities should be located so as not likely to become objectionable to the neighboring property because of noise, traffic, number of students, or other objectable conditions."

I do know I would not want to have this in my backyard. And the trees are shown -- I believe, frankly, they should be higher. They've been described as being 12 feet high. And we're told they would certainly not screen the building the way the planners would like them to be screened.

1 And certainly in the summertime, they will 2 be casting more shade in the backyard than certainly Anybody who is a serious gardener 3 is the case now. 4 will have to re-think their whole approach. 5 So, finally, in summation, this is the 6 building located on one of the most important streets 7 in America, and a building proposed to be built on one of the most important streets in America, one of the 8 9 most beautiful streets in America. It's an inspirational street. 10 I love driving by and seeing that CK]d Churchill -- I love 11 12 the British Embassy. I love -- and of course, there are modern buildings as well. The Finnish Embassy is 13 one of my favorites, which is beautifully screened and 14 15 forested to keep the forested character. 16 Additionally, the Brazilian Embassy 17 it's perpendicular modern structure, perpendicular, and almost disappears, perpendicular to 18 19 this magical, wonderful street. And the American University -- and I use 20 21 intentionally, it is -- it is -- it has that 22 important name. It's on an important street, and I think it has an important mission. Thank you. 23 24 MR. ELLIOTT: Thank you, Ms. Heyne. Just

for the record, the drawing that has the rendering is

1 American University's -- one of their two renderings. 2 But Heyne has drawn more of ${\tt Ms.}$ building off to the right, and there is still the Art 3 4 Gallery farther to the right of that. So, that 5 rendering is part of the building. Next, we have Michael Bilecky. 6 I'm going 7 to pass up to the Secretary copies of his longer He's going to summarize. Go ahead, Mr. 8 statement. 9 Bilecky. I'm Mike Bilecky, President 10 MR. BILECKY: Gaines Citizens Association. 11 Ft. Ft. Gaines 12 acknowledges benefit from having an arts center located on the Cassell site, 13 and we have openly 14 supported the concept. 15 However, the Ft. Gaines Citizens 16 Association voted unanimously on February 6th 17 oppose the further processing of the Katzen Arts Center as it's currently designed. 18 19 Nothing that has been presented since our 20 vote alters our objections. In 1989, an acceptable 21 building design was achieved for the proposed 130,000 22 square foot law center on the Cassell site. 23 The proposed arts center is not a 130,000 square foot project, but it is, in fact, a 260,000 24 25 foot structure because of a 130,000 square square

foot, 550-car garage.

After almost a year of discussion, design and negotiation, it is clearly evident that the 260,000 square foot structure cannot be accommodated on the Cassell site without vociferous objections from all neighborhoods.

The building design submitted for further processing has changed little from that initially presented to the neighbors last May. Ft. Gaines consistently objected to the height of the proposed building immediately adjacent to our homes.

We clearly identified the rotunda and the rear half of the third floor of the academic wing as being too close, too tall, and too imposing.

We do not believe that we have been unreasonable in expecting accommodations for our concerns, as the objectional building elements behind our homes constituted about 15,000 square feet of the proposed 260,000 square feet. That's only about six percent of the building.

Until mid-January, AU had made only token attempts at modifying the building design to assuage our objections. Most of their efforts were expended on increased grading and landscaping to shield our homes from the building.

But it was obvious that they considered their building design sacrosanct. It was not under John Fondersmith, of the Office of Planning, verbally expressed agreement with the neighbors' objections to building height that any significant attempt at building redesign was made.

A few words from the Office of Planning achieved something that the neighbors' months of negotiation could not.

After OP's impetus, about 4,800 square feet were eliminated from the objectionable third floor. That's less than two percent of the 260,000 square feet.

The resultant building design is as is currently presented in the campus plan and application for further processing. This building design is still objectionable; 11,000 square feet are still too close, too tall, and too imposing.

ΑU acknowledged their design has is objectionable proffering compensation the by Their offers have been ludicrously neighbors. inadequate.

We thank Mr. Fondersmith in the Office of Planning for getting the neighbors a two percent building concession out of AU. However, the tone and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 disappointing. The OP appears to give great weight and 3 mention to AU's menial concessions and supports AU's 4 5 current design. The report makes very little of the 6 real objections still held by the neighbors, 7 nothing identifying the building components are both higher closer our homes than existing 8 and to 9 structures on the Cassell site. 10 Further, the ΟP report suggests 11 conditions, but provides no means of dispute 12 resolution or enforcement. Lacking an appropriate seque, I'm just going to switch topics and briefly 13 14 challenge the traffic site. 15 MR. ELLIOTT: I'm going to interrupt you a 16 Bilecky has submitted his traffic second. Mr. 17 statement in our book. I forgot which tab it was. And we'll just skip that for the interest of time. 18 19 you have anything further on the arts center? MR. BILECKY: The arts center should not 20 21 be granted further processing until the neighbors 22 approve a design. 23 Thank you very much, MR. ELLIOTT: 24 Bilecky. Next, Mr. Herzstein. 25 MR. HERZSTEIN: Madam Chairman and Members

content of OP's report to the Zoning Commission is

1 of the Commission, I have submitted, on behalf of the 2 several citizens' organizations, a comprehensive 3 statement on March 22nd, and a further reply to the 4 University's response to that statement which, 5 unfortunately, I was only able to get in yesterday. We did the best we could. 6 7 It's -- as Mr. Elliott said, it's evident that you have read that, and I won't try to go over 8 9 I will hope to keep my comments very brief. will not try to review the various concerns we have. 10 I would like to --11 12 MR. ELLIOTT: Let me just mention those are both under Tab 3 of our book. 13 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. 14 15 MR. HERZSTEIN: And my first statement on 16 March 22nd had five exhibits attached to it. Exhibit C 17 has the summary of the neighbors' concerns. All I want to do on that is to highlight, as Mr. Harab, 18 19 Ambassador Harab, and others have done and will do, the critical importance of the population cap. 20 21 We think that the -- we can -- we can all we will over the years, 22 try, to contain 23 objectionable impacts by building fences, by watching particularly buildings, by watching lights and so on, 24

by worrying about traffic.

We will never succeed if we don't contain the population growth. That's the only -- that's the bottom and fundamental cause of these various other problems. And of course, we can try to deal with symptoms, but we must pay attention to the root cause. And from the point of view community, the most fundamental of all the concerns we have is the population cap. And as we indicate, we believe that cap should cap the existing population actually on the campus, and allow for roughly an eight percent growth over that. then, it's the But even not as University has said, it just needs growth -- it just needs flexibility for fluctuations in programs and not for permanent growth. There is a tendency for universities to want to grow to cover their expenses. Some of them behave like businesses. Well, we have more expenses; let's -- let's sell more product, as it were. When you have a -- number one, that's not the mission of a university. It's not to -- it's not to make money. It's to educate people. And number two, when you are worried about the university, in а residential context, not

overrunning its boundaries, obviously, you can't allow

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 it just to come in and say, "We need more money; we need to take in more students, and therefore, allow us 2 3 to grow." I won't summarize the other concerns we 4 5 We did address in my statement, in the body of have. 6 the statement, some of the measures we think need to 7 be taken to straighten this plan out. But as you indicated earlier, it's not necessary, I think, for me 8 9 to go into that at length now. 10 Let me just say, in summary, that the basic -- basic challenge for the Zoning Commission, in 11 12 our view, in cases like this is to determine the level of confidence that the Commission, that the D.C. 13 14 Government, and the neighbors can have in the -- in 15 the protection given by the zoning regulation. 16 The standard in the zoning regulation 17 appears very strong. A university is not allowed to 18 function in a residential community if it is -- unless 19 it can show that it is not likely to become objectionable. 20 21 That's a very strong standard on its face. 22 A neighbor looking at that would say, "Oh, 23 goodness, that's -- that's really good. That's really

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

comes

problem

24

25

going to protect us."

The

the

in

actual

administration of it. And there, as I say, the challenge in each case, it seems to me, is for the Commission to decide how much confidence its going to insist on, how much it's going to insist on in order to give a proper level of confidence.

In the early years of this university and others, the problem is not very great. But as the universities get bigger and begin to fill their envelopes, and as the community gets more crowded, obviously the risk of adverse impact is very high.

Experience in recent years has shown, as you well know, that this law is not working very well in other neighborhoods. I would challenge anyone to tell me that the universities in Foggy Bottom and in Georgetown have not had objectionable impacts over the years, have not had adverse impacts on those communities.

Our community is not, fortunately, suffering as much. But we are suffering, as you will hear from witnesses. And we see the handwriting on the wall. We don't want to become another Foggy Bottom. An unlimited growth and inadequate attention to this basic standard of objectionable conditions is the -- is the root cause of this.

Now, why is it that the -- that the law

hasn't been working in some of those towns, in some of those communities? I know the Office of Planning is studying this, and you're working on new regulations.

And I'm certainly not a planning expert.

But as a lawyer looking at this, and having worked on

-- on the neighborhood relationship with the

University for about 15 years now through these two

separate proceedings, I have a few comments based on

experience.

The first problem is, I think, inadequate attention to consulting and taking in the views of neighbors before the initial plan is drawn up. I think the habit of the universities, including this one in this case, is to draw up the plan and then say, "Okay, let's consult the neighbors."

I think if they behaved as the BZA required AU to behave in 1988, when they sent the plan back and said, "Consult with the neighbors equally with the university, and draw up a plan that meets the needs of both of them," I think there's a much better chance of coming up with a proper plan. That's problem number one.

Problem number two is I think the plans that the University has come up with are vague. They want to keep their options open. They -- they come up

with --

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Herzstein, I can sense a little bit of nervousness on the part of some of your colleagues. I think if you're done addressing specifically the merits of the case --

MR. HERZSTEIN: Okay.

MR. ELLIOTT: Well, let me ask you if you are. We're okay with the time right now, Bob. If you could shoot toward being done by 17 minutes, we'll be good.

MR. HERZSTEIN: Okay. I'm just about done. The -- the next problem is, as I said, the problem of vagueness. Then, there's a problem of this two-stage process. How much confidence should one insist at the first stage, and how much should one allow the University to say "Oh, we'll take care of that in further processing"?

In the paper we filed yesterday, responding to the University, we addressed a number of situations where virtually every issue that we raised, the University has brushed off with a comment that, "We'll take care of that. We'll paper that over at the -- now, and we'll look at it at the next stage."

A further problem that underlies the difficulty of these campus plans is that the

conditions imposed, or the conditions suggested, by the universities, and sometimes the conditions imposed, are too vague. So, there is no rule of law, even after the campus plan and its conditions go into place.

And then, of course, there's the problem of enforcement, which the Office of Planning, itself, has called attention to, and we certainly have called attention to. We think there is a way out of that.

We have suggested that, in our filings with you, we think that it's entirely within the scope of the authority of the Commission to require the University, as a way of addressing and heading off objectionable conditions, to establish an arbitration mechanism.

The Commission would not be imposing this mechanism. The Commission would be saying, "Look, experience has shown that you have problems between hearings with us. You have problems getting along with the neighbors. The neighbors feel there are objectionable conditions. There is no way they can get accountability."

So, we suggest to you that a way to get approval from us is to set up a mechanism for taking care of these problems. And we do urge you to give

1 careful attention to this question of enforcement in 2 between hearings at the Zoning Commission. 3 MR. ELLIOTT: Thank you, Bob. 4 MR. HERZSTEIN: Thank you very much. 5 Next, Priscilla Holmes, and MR. ELLIOTT: 6 I would appreciate if the Commission would turn to Tab 7 She wants to show you the photographs that are numbered at the end of her written statement. Would 8 9 you go ahead, Priscilla? 10 MS. HOLMES: Yes, Madam Chair. Thank you 11 very much --12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You need to speak into the microphone. 13 MS. HOLMES: Okay. I'm Priscilla Holmes. 14 15 I live at 4710 Woodway Lane, Northwest. Our property 16 borders directly on AU for 450 feet, nothing in 17 Our property is high and overlooks 18 campus, so we see а great deal of its western 19 perimeter. These impacts also affect other neighbors, 20 21 Quebec Street, University Avenue, Rockwood Parkway, But we want to emphasize that for all of 22 and so on. us, it's important that the University not be allowed 23 develop the center of this campus by pushing 24 25 everything over to the peripheries of the -- of the

| 1 | neighbors that have no barrier between them, southern |
|----|--|
| 2 | and western neighbors. |
| 3 | Well, I want to go on and mention some of |
| 4 | the conditions in the 1989 agreement which I think |
| 5 | should be renewed, continued, and enforced. |
| 6 | Now, the screening and planting is of |
| 7 | basic importance. We face a tremendous number of big |
| 8 | buildings on our on the western side of the campus. |
| 9 | The screening has improved. They've planted some of |
| 10 | the things, but it remains deciduous, gaps in between, |
| 11 | not tall enough. |
| 12 | If you look at Picture 1, you'll see there |
| 13 | the view from our back yard. |
| 14 | COMMISSIONER HOLMAN: Did Mr. Elliott say |
| 15 | Tab 8? |
| 16 | MS. HOLMES: Yes. I think you know it's |
| 17 | under Exhibit 8, right? |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, I think Mr. |
| 19 | Elliott told them. |
| 20 | MR. ELLIOTT: The numbers are in the |
| 21 | right-hand corner, the top, with the book straight up. |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We're amazingly |
| 23 | adaptable. We've got it. |
| 24 | MS. HOLMES: You've got it. Good. |
| 25 | Picture 2 is the same view at night where you see some |

1 of the lights. Picture 3 shows the view of the campus 2 that we get from our front porch at 4710. 3 If you look at the middle of that photo, 4 you'll see the famous AU logo, which we see from our 5 When we were talking to the University and porch. 6 landscape experts about the screening, they admitted 7 that it wasn't adequate. But they were rather vaque about what they would do about it. 8 9 So, we think there should be clear and 10 specific landscape planning to take care of these existing conditions and to comply with the zoning 11 12 regulations. Also, there should be a requirement of 13 maintenance. Western Road -- we have no map here, but 14 15 that road runs right along our property next to the 16 playing field. And it was supposed to be closed to 17 parking under the '89 agreement. However -- I skipped one picture. Look at 18 19 Picture 4. You see some of the cars parked along that 20 road, completely in violation of the agreement -- of 21 the order of --MR. ELLIOTT: That would be five --22 23 MS. HOLMES: -- plan. MR. ELLIOTT: -- and four is the AU logo. 24 25 MS. HOLMES: Well, there are two of the AU

1 Picture 5 -- is that what I said -- is the cars 2 parked along the road, which are -- which there are 3 not supposed to be any. 4 Also, on Picture 6, you see some more 5 That was taken four weeks before, while this cars. 6 proceeding was in progress. 7 This road, the western roadway, will be abandoned under the new plan, which will be a great 8 9 I think that it should have a proposed improvement. 10 time frame there in the plan. And meanwhile, I think the Office of 11 12 Planning and the University have agreed that both ends of the road will be chained off. And all traffic and 13 parking will be limited only to necessary University 14 maintenance vehicles. 15 16 Lights, the lights at night, especially 17 from Watkins, shine directly on us. In Picture 7, you can see the effect of the lights. With some of the 18 19 proposed buildings, they would be that much worse. Noise, there is considerable noise a lot 20 21 of the time. Radio Center and University have very noisy generators which vibrate our house. Cars play 22 23 their radios loud, wandering past on that road. When the games are used -- when the games 24 25 are played on the field next to us, and even on the

1 one by University Lane, we can hear them, especially 2 when they have their loud-speakers turned outward. Priscilla, if I could just 3 MR. ELLIOTT: 4 ask you to explain this one, final set of double 5 pictures, and then we'll move to Mr. Ruttenburg? MS. HOLMES: Well, let me -- let me finish 6 7 up here. I'll skip that one. There are several other items in here, which you can find in Exhibit -- in the 8 9 exhibit, which we feel, very strongly, should be considered. 10 Building F is much, much, much too big. A 11 12 and B are not needed, and so on; and some of the items which the University has not been enforcing. 13 In protection 14 short, we want careful our 15 neighborhood's rights to enjoy privacy and 16 tranquility. 17 MR. ELLIOTT: And that double set of pictures, what is that, just in two words, if you can? 18 19 MS. HOLMES: This is the way the screening 20 looked before the improvements in 1989 from University 21 Avenue. 22 MR. ELLIOTT: Thank you very much. Next, 23 going to have Mr. Ruttenburg address the Не is the President of 24 Commission. the AU 25 Citizens Association.

1 MR. **RUTTENBURG:** Madam Chairman and 2 Members of the Commission, in the brief time that I have to present this testimony, I would like to make 3 4 three recommendations for action by the Commission. 5 First, definition of the American University Campus; it is fully within the authority of 6 7 this Commission to establish appropriate campus boundaries. And the Commission should include the law 8 school and its population within those boundaries. 9 10 Second, not only should the Commission 11 include the law school in the campus boundaries, but 12 also it should limit the total AU population increase to a modest percentage to allow for the "flexibility" 13 referred to be AU's witnesses in their testimony. 14 15 Third, should the Commission authorize a 16 significant increase in the AU Campus population, say 17 in excess of eight percent, as has been suggested, such increase should be tied to the provision of 18 19 adequate housing and parking in connection with such 20 increases. 21 For example, one for one after a certain percentage has been reached, as has been done in the 22 23 case of campus plans recently decided by the BZA. American University Campus extends 24

west to 46th and Massachusetts, two blocks from the

law school. Not only is the law school extremely close to the main campus; it has major relationships to the main campus.

Law students use main campus facilities.

Law students use main campus facilities.

Many park on the main campus. The AU shuttle bus travels from the law school to the main campus and beyond.

Law students participate in main campus activities, and have major impacts on residential properties nearby, some of which are not more than 30 to 40 feet away, and on the community shopping facilities as well.

The law school book store is not at the law school, but is on the main campus. And financial matters are handled for law school students on the main campus.

AU has conveniently omitted any data with regard to where the 1,500 law students, approximately, reside, and has not included, in its traffic studies, any data with regard to travel in the area by law students.

It is though the law school does not exist, but it does exist and is an integral part of the University. There is no rationale reason why the law school property should not be included as part of

1 the campus, and the students included in a population 2 cap established pursuant to the campus plan. Let me address a specific issue regarding 3 4 to the law school and the Office of Planning. 5 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Ruttenburg, I'm 6 just going to -- I'm going to stop you there because 7 early on, we talked about the fact that it really is outside the jurisdiction of the Zoning Commission to 8 9 extend the campus to include the law school because 10 where it's located, it's being -- it's permitted by 11 right because it's in a commercial zone. 12 I've allowed you to go on to some So, 13 extent --MR. RUTTENBURG: respectfully 14 May Ι 15 disagree and I raise my point? I think the Commission 16 has the authority to determine campus boundaries. 17 it does have the authority -- and I've searched all the cases. I've looked at the law, and I've talked to 18 19 a lot of people who are experts in this field. 20 I'm not a zoning lawyer; I'm an attorney. 21 And this Zoning Commission, as distinguished from the BZA, in my opinion, does have such authority if it 22 23 chooses to do so. I'm not saying you're required to do so, 24 25 and I'm not saying that the University has no ability

| 1 | to acquire this building, which it did and has. But I |
|----|--|
| 2 | think the Zoning Commission does have such authority. |
| 3 | |
| 4 | And I hope you would not assume it |
| 5 | doesn't, because I think that would be a mistake of |
| 6 | law. So, that's my view. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, we disagree |
| 8 | about that. |
| 9 | MR. RUTTENBURG: Now, may I continue? I'd |
| LO | like to. |
| L1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I I would |
| L2 | like to focus on the campus plan that's before us, and |
| L3 | not dwell on the law school |
| L4 | MR. RUTTENBURG: Well |
| L5 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: and its inclusion. |
| L6 | MR. RUTTENBURG: the Office of Planning |
| L7 | and I'm jumping in my testimony because it's been |
| L8 | interrupted. But the Office of Planning made it very |
| L9 | clear to us during our discussions that the law school |
| 20 | has a major impact on the community and that something |
| 21 | should be done with it. |
| 22 | In fact, in our most recent submission, |
| 23 | the addendum to the main report says that somehow, |
| 24 | there should be a parking plan put into effect. |
| | |

| 1 | that heck, you can't even discuss the law school and |
|----|--|
| 2 | its parking, then I don't see how anybody can put a |
| 3 | parking plan into effect. |
| 4 | I think it would be a mistake. I think |
| 5 | the Zoning Commission does have such authority. And |
| 6 | I'm strongly urging that you consider that |
| 7 | possibility. |
| 8 | Our parking plan that we now have was the |
| 9 | result of the settlement of litigation, which American |
| 10 | University Park to which American University Park |
| 11 | was not a party. We have no enforcement power with |
| 12 | regard to that. |
| 13 | Moreover, that plan is very flawed. I |
| 14 | won't go into the details. But it expires in five |
| 15 | years. At the end of that, we don't have anything. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: How much more |
| 17 | testimony did you have about the law school? |
| 18 | MR. RUTTENBURG: Well, I have some about |
| 19 | no, I think that it's not too much about the law |
| 20 | school. It's more on housing and so forth. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That would be great. |
| 22 | We would love to hear that. |
| 23 | MR. RUTTENBURG: All right. Incidently, |
| 24 | before I finish on the law school issue I know I'm |
| 25 | trying your patience, but I have my one shot after a |

1 year's work, and I want -- I want to take it. 2 Our counsel has made a filing -- made a 3 filing on February 15th, and I refer to Part 4 of that 4 where he goes into detail about --5 MR. ELLIOTT: And let me mention, that is 6 under Tab 1. We did brief this about nine pages. 7 would urge you to at least read that again, Madam Chair. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And we will. 10 MR. ELLIOTT: Thank you. 11 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. 12 MR. RUTTENBURG: Now, with regard to -and incidentally, I did update that. It was submitted 13 14 on February 15th, a 50-so page statement of our case, 15 and I updated it yesterday. It's 56 pages now. And 16 that's submitted as part of our case. 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. MR. RUTTENBURG: With regard to 18 the 19 population cap, this Commission should limit AU's 20 total population increase to a modest percentage to 21 allow for AU's requested "flexibility". That's their 22 word. 23 It is hard to understand the need for a potential increase of 1,750 FTE students, and more 24 25 than that in bodies, in order to provide for enrollment fluctuations.

Should the Commission authorize a significant increase in the AU Campus population, it should be tied to the provision of adequate housing and parking.

AU's request for a population cap could consist of a number of additional undergraduates, who raise special problems for the communities. AU's testimony made it clear that it has no parking plan for its on-campus student population.

Now under pressure, it has indicated it will establish a plan, the details of which need to be worked out. But as you know, they don't include the law school, and you're not letting us talk about it.

And I won't go into the parking plan that's in effect now. I already -- I already mentioned that.

As to housing, AU claims there are only 24 student houses in Zone 16. AU conveniently neglected to mention that there are an additional 900 students in area apartments, and has omitted statistical data with respect to student houses for the 1,400-plus law students at 4801 Mass.

We are trying very hard to avoid the community damage, which has occurred in Foggy Bottom

and Burleith. The Commission has the opportunity to predict -- to protect nearby residential areas from AU encroachment.

AU points to the parking facilities which would be provided by the construction, authorized by its 2000 campus plan, if approved. These facilities may never be built.

Over the last decade, AU built only 12,000 square feet of the construction authorized by its campus plan. It concedes that it needs to obtain funding for the structures proposed, except for the three for which it is currently requesting further processing.

And as Mr. Elliott mentioned, no more than 400,000 square feet were built in any event. No one which buildings will which be built. Therefore, we see a potential for authorization of 1,750 additional students, significant FTEno additional housing, no parking plan, potentially few additional on-campus parking facilities, and a grave possibility of drastically increased housing and neighborhood parking.

The proposed campus plan provides for almost no additional dormitory space. AU would have you believe that by adding 1,750 students with no

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

77 additional campus housing, and potentially no additional campus parking, would not result in a major increase in student housing and parking in American University Park, Spring Valley, and Spring Valley Court. is a myth. As student increases to a significant degree in our areas, will result in a destabilization of our communities. should not be allowed to happen. That's my statement, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.

MR. ELLIOTT: Before I turn to our final witness, Paul Duke, just let me mention, Madam Chair, that on the parking issue, which Mr. Ruttenburg just mentioned, as you know, AU did come forward with the exact wording of the condition order from Mount Vernon. It's only three words different.

And in my opening statement that I submitted in writing, Tab 1, we made a number of suggestions as to how to make that work at AU.

And I think particularly the biggest problem AU has in making that work, and getting the cars off the street, is identification of the cars. That's what really needs to be corrected.

The other thing we point out in the filing

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 of March 21, page three, is you need to work with a geographic area on this parking thing. 2 Because kids 3 are smart, and they walk, and they jog. 4 And if you have a particular geographic 5 area, they can go one more block. So, this has to be 6 a dynamic process between the University and the 7 neighbors to have it cover the right area. If they go far enough, maybe who cares? 8 9 But if they are two blocks -- if the area patrols two blocks and they're going one more block, you've got 10 the problem just pushed out to three blocks. 11 12 So, I would urge you on the parking item, where there has been progress, to look at 13 suggestions to close the loop there. 14 15 Finally, Paul Duke, President of Spring 16 Valley Court Association. 17 MR. DUKE: I'm not the president. MR. ELLIOTT: I correct myself. Paul Duke 18 19 is --20 MR. DUKE: I see our time is practically 21 running out, and I'm going to try to be blessedly 22 brief in keeping with what Elizabeth Taylor promised 23 her sixth husband, "Don't worry; I won't keep you long." 24 25 (Laughter.)

You've now heard most of the major and Ι think they boil down arguments, to overriding fear, that our community will be overrun swallowed up by an ambitious and powerful institution.

Two all-important things are at stake here. The first is the quality of life in the affected neighborhoods. You've heard about the parking problem. That's a growing problem.

And you, Mr. Hood -- the other night at one of the hearings, you hit the nail right on the head when you said they didn't have any realistic anti-parking problem. In fact, in my view, you might say the main problem is that AU will not even acknowledge that there is a serious problem. And that includes, as Mr. Ruttenburg just said -- the law school is part of the problem too.

A related concern is the congestion caused by AU's expansionist moves, especially around the Spring Valley Shopping Center, with some of the commercial establishments catering more and more to AU students.

Nothing wrong with that in theory; but we don't want our lovely little shopping area to become primarily a mecca for students.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I was part of small group some years ago that worked hard to achieve to historical status for the shopping center, since it's one of the country's original shopping centers.

We want it to remain what it has always a place to serve the needs of the residents. Hence, the necessity, the absolute necessity, of a real, meaningful, hard and population cap, certainly much less than the one which has been proposed.

This leads me to my second point of what's at stake, and that is the preservation of the City's treasured, old neighborhoods. As you well know, this is something that Mayor Williams has talked quite a bit about; not just about the preservation of the neighborhoods, as such, but the preservation of their flavor, and their ambiance, and their basic character.

Now, let me say, as others have said, we're not here as enemies of progress or AU bashers. Most of us really like having an institution -- an institution of higher learning as part of our community.

What we don't like is for AU to feel it can run rough-shod over the community's wishes. All too often, AU operates in a style reminiscent of a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 famous Defense Secretary, who once said, "What's good 2 for General Motors is good for the country." 3 In this case, what's good for AU is not necessarily good 4 for the City, or the City's 5 residents. 6 We've been hearing a great deal lately 7 about a new era of bipartisanship here in Washington. It would be nice to think that that cooperative 8 9 spirit would encourage AU to be more conciliatory and 10 less unbending in its negotiations with the neighbors, 11 so we could all live in peace and harmony. 12 Madam Chairwoman, in your deliberations, I would just urge your and your fellow Commissioners to 13 14 words of the ancient the Roman Statesman, 15 Cicero, when he said, "The good of the people is the 16 highest law there is." Thank you. I give you back 17 two seconds. (Applause.) 18 19 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you very much. 20 Well done, Mr. Elliott. You are to be congratulated. 21 (Laughter.) 22 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Now, maybe you can 23 help facilitate if we need to bring people up to You'll have to bring the right 24 answer questions. 25 people forward. Questions from the Commissioners for

| 1 | these folks? Go ahead. |
|----|--|
| 2 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I just have a |
| 3 | couple of statements. I'm hearing the testimony, and |
| 4 | I guess I'm kind of taken back because I was under the |
| 5 | assumption that there have been a lot of people at the |
| 6 | table for a while, dealing with the campus plan. |
| 7 | Would I be correct and I can ask Ms. |
| 8 | Holmes and Mr. Herzstein if not if not, then who |
| 9 | was at the table? Who were they working dealing |
| LO | with? Because it seems like I guess, unless I'm |
| L1 | understanding incorrectly, it seems as though I'm |
| L2 | hearing that you all weren't at the table in |
| L3 | negotiating this this plan. |
| L4 | MS. HOLMES: Are you asking me? |
| L5 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Either one, Ms. |
| L6 | Holmes let me hear from Ms. Holmes, if you don't |
| L7 | mind. |
| L8 | MS. HOLMES: I think as we |
| L9 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Turn your mic |
| 20 | your microphone |
| 21 | MS. HOLMES: The University had its plan |
| 22 | ready before they consulted us at all, and presented |
| 23 | us with it. |
| 24 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, in other |
| 25 | words, they brought you something. They didn't ask |

1 you for your input? 2 MS. HOLMES: Yes. VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 3 Okay. 4 MR. HERZSTEIN: Yeah, we felt we were 5 digging our way out of a hole, rather than working 6 collaboratively with them on devising a plan that 7 would work for both of us. VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Now, as far 8 9 as being cooperative, Mr. Herzstein, you read earlier where when you have different functions at your house, 10 you just make a phone call to the dean, and he usually 11 12 accommodates you. Is that -- that's true? MR. HERZSTEIN: Yes, the 1989 campus plan 13 has a very detailed exhibit in it called "Use of the 14 Athletic Fields," and it sets rules for the use of the 15 16 that they won't fields so be intrusive on 17 neighbors. And one paragraph in there says that if a 18 19 neighbor is having a function and let's the University know in advance, the University will try and avoid a 20 21 conflicting function that's going to create noise. 22 Interestingly, in the proposed continuing 23 conditions the counsel for the University presented to you, they picked up everything in that 24 25 exhibit except that paragraph.

| 1 | We don't know why. We haven't had the |
|----|--|
| 2 | chance to talk with them yet. In one of the latest |
| 3 | pleadings, Ms. Dwyer said they're ready to continue |
| 4 | everything from the '89 plan. |
| 5 | But we have to we feel we have to weed |
| 6 | through it and find each detail that may have been |
| 7 | left out. |
| 8 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. |
| 9 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Anyway, that's that's |
| 10 | the situation there. Now, they are also supposed to |
| 11 | notify us of special events that create noise. And |
| 12 | just last summer, there was an event, a very big event |
| 13 | where the speakers the loud speakers were out |
| 14 | there, and were turned right toward our house. |
| 15 | There was no advance notice, and the |
| 16 | speakers were being used incorrectly. Very nicely, |
| 17 | David Taylor responded quickly and apologized for |
| 18 | that, but |
| 19 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Herzstein, I'm |
| 20 | going to cut you off |
| 21 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Okay. |
| 22 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: because I guess |
| 23 | I have a time limit too. So, I want to make sure |
| 24 | MR. HERZSTEIN: I'm sorry. |
| 25 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I know I don't, |

| 1 | but I've got the logistics of your |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. HERZSTEIN: You can sense that we have |
| 3 | a lot of concerns and |
| 4 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, I have the |
| 5 | list of your comments. The other question is, is this |
| 6 | typical, the picture? I'm not exactly sure, Ms. |
| 7 | Holmes, in your presentation I think it was five |
| 8 | and Picture 5. Is that typical of what happens |
| 9 | normally? Does this go on all the time, where you |
| 10 | park where it says "no parking"? |
| 11 | MS. HOLMES: Yes, yes, where the cars are, |
| 12 | yes. |
| 13 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And I would say |
| 14 | this, I believe Mr. Reinberg |
| 15 | MR. RUTTENBURG: Ruttenburg. |
| 16 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ruttenburg, I'm |
| 17 | sorry, excuse me. I will say that I found your |
| 18 | testimony interesting. While I may be in difference |
| 19 | with my colleagues, I would have like to have heard a |
| 20 | little more. But since |
| 21 | MR. RUTTENBURG: So would I, Mr. Hood. |
| 22 | (Laughter.) |
| 23 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right. But I'll |
| 24 | wait and deal with that on the back end. Right now, I |
| 25 | don't have any other questions, Madam Chair. Thank |

you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER HOLMAN: I guess this is to the panel. I don't know exactly who to address this to. I've heard testimony that the University should have a firm cap that's much lower than the cap that they propose.

What do you perceive to be that magic number, and how do you -- how would you support that number, if you have one?

MR. ELLIOTT: While Bob is reaching for something, let me suggest what we put in our papers, which is they have said they don't plan growth, but they have good years. When they want to accept more than average students, they have temporary fluctuations.

Then, they get back to about where they In that line, I think, in principle, we would are. them -- we would like to like to see see the population cap keyed to the current level, but with room for some fluctuations and with them getting back they decide to where they are when to up temporarily.

COMMISSIONER HOLMAN: And by "the current level," you don't mean the current number in the

1 population cap of '89, but the current number of 2 students actually on the campus? That's correct; 3 MR. ELLIOTT: they've 4 given you those numbers. And that's where the 25 5 If you were to give them the cap they percent comes. 6 want, that's 25 percent higher than where they are 7 today. COMMISSIONER **HOLMAN:** So, 8 let me 9 understand your answer; because what we're talking about is a cap with flexibility, so what you're saying 10 11 is the basic, current enrollment should be the cap. 12 And then, how would you accommodate the flexibility? I'm not trying to put words in your mouth. 13 MR. ELLIOTT: You could allow, say, eight 14 15 percent above for periods when the accept more 16 1989 cap was eight percent students. The above 17 current population levels at that time. I think eight percent -- I mean, that's something we cross examined 18 19 about. I think eight percent is what we would 20 21 suggest temporarily because that's what they said they They don't need 25 percent. 22 need. It becomes 23 meaningless if you go to 25 percent. COMMISSIONER HOLMAN: Thanks. 24 25 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Can I follow up on

1 that? Mr. Herzstein, I see in here that you called 2 for a cap of 10,175 students, and 2,193 employees. Is 3 that correct? That's your proposal? 4 MR. HERZSTEIN: That's the number that was 5 in my papers, yes, sir. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: At Exhibit C? 6 7 MR. HERZSTEIN: That's correct. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And that's about 8 9 eight to ten percent, according to your calculations? 10 MR. HERZSTEIN: That's correct. 11 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I had a question that 12 Mr. Franklin wanted us to ask, which is -- and maybe this -- Mr. Bilecky would be the best person to answer 13 this, if he can. I don't know how long he has lived 14 15 there. 16 But Mr. Franklin was curious as to the 17 the Cassell Building when it in nature of operation, particularly the use of the service road at 18 19 the back of the facility. Is that something that 20 you're familiar with? 21 MR. BILECKY: I think I've been in my home And when I moved there, the Cassell 22 seven years. 23 Building was in operation. I don't really have a distinct recollection of disruption from the service 24 25 road.

| | do have very bad recorrections of |
|----|--|
| 2 | parking on our streets when the building was in use. |
| 3 | Once they moved the law students out of there |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And the building was |
| 5 | in use as a sports facility; is that |
| 6 | MR. BILECKY: Law I believe they were |
| 7 | using it as law. There's a couple other residents |
| 8 | here that could answer these questions a lot more |
| 9 | clearly than I. |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I'll put it to |
| 11 | them too when |
| 12 | MR. BILECKY: Okay. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: when they come up. |
| 14 | So, thank thank you for addressing that. I would |
| 15 | like to ask a question of Ms. Holmes about this |
| 16 | Photograph No. 7. |
| 17 | What's the nature of the of the bright |
| 18 | lights? I mean, that's sort of atypical of just |
| 19 | regular building light. Can you |
| 20 | MS. HOLMES: The lights |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I need you to speak |
| 22 | into the microphone. |
| 23 | MS. HOLMES: Do you mean the kind of light |
| 24 | that's generating that effect? |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, a building that |

| 1 | just has lights on, on the inside, typically would not |
|----|--|
| 2 | give off, you know, these sort of individual bright |
| 3 | lights. Can you describe to me why |
| 4 | MS. HOLMES: Looking out, say, my kitchen |
| 5 | window, there are several big windows facing us from |
| 6 | Watkins. And when they aren't shielded, these lights |
| 7 | are very bright. They come right through the dark |
| 8 | night at us. |
| 9 | Now, exactly what you mean by the glow |
| 10 | effect, that may be the photography. Is it? Let me |
| 11 | ask him. |
| 12 | MR. HERZSTEIN: It's hard to photograph it |
| 13 | exactly. I think some of that is a glow from the |
| 14 | camera. |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, so there's not |
| 16 | lights that are being sort of aimed out from the |
| 17 | building? |
| 18 | MR. HERZSTEIN: No. What it is, is large |
| 19 | very large, square windows covering the whole side |
| 20 | of the building, a sort of 1950's picture-window |
| 21 | building with fluorescent lights, bright fluorescent |
| 22 | lights, in each of the rooms, because they're studio |
| 23 | rooms. Students come in there and do sculpting and so |
| 24 | forth. |
| 1 | i |

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:

Okay.

| 1 | MR. HERZSTEIN: They don't have any |
|----|--|
| 2 | effective screens on them. And so, what you see |
| 3 | basically is a I've compared it once before to a |
| 4 | Mondrian painting where you get big squares looking at |
| 5 | you. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So, is the |
| 7 | offensive nature of the light when you're when |
| 8 | you're outside and you can see that there's a building |
| 9 | over there, or is this somehow actually shining into |
| 10 | your dwelling? |
| 11 | MS. HOLMES: It shines into our dwelling |
| 12 | also. It's true of both outside and inside on that |
| 13 | side of the building, it's got the dining room; it's |
| 14 | got the kitchen; it has other rooms; a guest room |
| 15 | upstairs. It's very difficult to enjoy your view at |
| 16 | all when there are bright lights. |
| 17 | And the windows happen to be slanted, so |
| 18 | they go right toward our house. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, I think I |
| 20 | understand. |
| 21 | MR. HERZSTEIN: I could I could just |
| 22 | mention that the 1989 plan has explicit commitment by |
| 23 | the University to shield those windows. |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And I think I |
| 25 | remember the discussion with Mr. Abud about the |

1 trouble that they've had trying to accommodate that 2 requirement. 3 MR. HERZSTEIN: Right. 4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Herzstein, in 5 your statement that was filed previously, and that you 6 drew on tonight, one of the comments that you made in 7 there was the fact that the AU parking fees that they high, and that that is somehow 8 charge now are 9 encouraging people to park in the community. 10 Well, we heard testimony from the 11 University that their -- what they charge is actually 12 half of what would be a market rate. And Mr. Laden, from the Department of 13 Public Works had suggested that raising the 14 15 higher would be a way of encouraging people to take 16 public transportation and so on. 17 Could you reconcile your position with what we've heard? 18 19 MR. HERZSTEIN: Well, Ι think there's 20 probably an economist's or a planner's dilemma here. 21 From the macro point of view, I guess having very high 22 fees encourages more people to take other 23 transportation. 24 But where you're in the specific 25 neighborhood near one of those parking lots, and the

1 alternative for an individual parker who has decided 2 not to take the public transportation is to either pay 3 the high fee or park in your street. 4 Then, the high fee operates as an 5 incentive for them to park in the street. 6 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: When you say that 7 it's "high," it's high relative to what? Because the market rate, if they were to park in some kind of 8 9 private arrangement -- at least the testimony has been 10 would be approximately twice that it what the 11 University charges. 12 So, when you say it's "high" --Oh, I just mean -- I think 13 MR. HERZSTEIN: -- number one, it's higher than what it was, and what 14 15 it was supposed to be in the 1989 plan; not by a great 16 deal, I think. But it has gone up some. 17 Number two, it's simply high in the view of the student. These are students who are -- many of 18 19 them are trying to get by on a limited income. 20 it's just much cheaper for them to park in the street 21 than to park in the lot. 22 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, it's high is 23 relative to free? 24 MR. HERZSTEIN: Yeah, exactly. 25 (Laughter.)

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, I'll agree with |
|----|---|
| 2 | that. |
| 3 | MR. HERZSTEIN: But that's the reality |
| 4 | we're dealing with. |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Any other |
| 6 | questions from the Commissioners? |
| 7 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: No. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Ms. Dwyer, did you |
| 9 | have some cross examination? |
| 10 | MS. DWYER: I will try and keep this |
| 11 | brief. The first set of questions is for Priscilla |
| 12 | Holmes. And I just in looking at these |
| 13 | photographs, I just wanted to ask you what kind of |
| 14 | lens was used to take the photos from your yard, |
| 15 | because the view looks foreshortened? |
| 16 | And I wondered if you could state, for the |
| 17 | record, what kind of lens. |
| 18 | MS. HOLMES: The one from the backyard, |
| 19 | number |
| 20 | MS. DWYER: Number one? |
| 21 | MS. HOLMES: Let me refer to my |
| 22 | photographer. Did you take this picture? |
| 23 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Yes. That's a normal |
| 24 | lens; I would say roughly a 50 millimeter. It's the |
| 25 | equivalent of a 50 millimeter lens on a 35 millimeter |

1 camera, which is the normal lens you use for 2 average photograph; the same with number two. And number three is probably like a 75 3 4 millimeter lens. In order to get rid of all of that 5 clutter of branches in front, that's slightly, but not 6 significantly, longer focal length than a normal 7 camera. And number four, the same way; that is a 8 9 roughly -- the equivalent, if you were using a 35 10 millimeter camera, of a --11 MS. DWYER: But were you using a 35 12 millimeter at this point, or a 75 millimeter? MR. HERZSTEIN: No, this was a digital 13 camera, but that's -- that's the equivalent. 14 15 MS. DWYER: Okay, so you used three 16 different kinds of cameras to take these photos? MR. HERZSTEIN: No, I think they're all 17 taken with one kind of camera. 18 19 MS. DWYER: Well, different kinds of lenses? 20 21 MR. HERZSTEIN: Well, different focal 22 The basic point is that everyone who has lengths. 23 come out and stood on our front porch, including your planners, has said, "Oh, yes, I can see the need for 24 25 more screening there."

1 There is effective screening -- if 2 look to the left of picture number three, you see a 3 couple of tall pine trees. One of those is on our 4 property, but a couple of them are on the border of 5 the University property. And they do a nice job of 6 screening those buildings. 7 But they aren't in the place -- they aren't going all across. It wouldn't be a difficult 8 9 matter to put a few more of those in. It would take 10 some years for them to grow, but it would just not be a difficult job. 11 12 And it also wouldn't be difficult to take down the logo until the trees have grown up. 13 MS. 14 DWYER: Have you suggested 15 landscaping condition for the University for this 16 area? Have you proposed to them --17 MR. HERZSTEIN: No. I quess I -- if you want me to hire a landscaper and come up with a plan, 18 19 I can do that. Ten years ago, EDA did a very nice job of working with us and the University. And they came 20 21 out, and they looked at things, and they said, "Let's 22 put these trees here and those trees there." 23 And a lot of the problem is taken care. The problem now is holes, which haven't been taken 24

care of.

| 1 | MS. DWYER: Mr. Herzstein, I'm looking at |
|----|--|
| 2 | the two photographs, Photographs 3 and 4, and looking, |
| 3 | for example, at the AU logo. In one photo, it looks |
| 4 | significantly closer to your property than in the |
| 5 | other. |
| 6 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Well, we |
| 7 | MS. DWYER: At what locations were these |
| 8 | photos taken? |
| 9 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Oh, the second one, as is |
| LO | shown on there, is from University Avenue. That's |
| L1 | from that's not from our house. That was designed |
| L2 | to show give a better picture of the logo, and also |
| L3 | to support the testimony you'll be hearing from |
| L4 | University Avenue people. |
| L5 | MS. DWYER: All right. So, Photograph 3 |
| L6 | is taken from your property? |
| L7 | MR. HERZSTEIN: That's right. |
| L8 | MS. DWYER: That's your view? |
| L9 | MR. HERZSTEIN: That's right. |
| 20 | MS. DWYER: And does that accurately |
| 21 | reflect that your property is 400 feet from the |
| 22 | nearest building on campus? |
| 23 | MR. HERZSTEIN: I can't give you the |
| 24 | the foot numbers. The problem this shows you what |
| 25 | you see. And actually, you can talk about telephoto |

| eye, it looks at something that catches the eye. |
|---|
| 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, |
| It doesn't sort of take in the whole |
| scene, as though one were looking at a photograph. |
| And that logo, the smokestack, the big square |
| building, those are things that stand out. |
| Especially the logo catches your eye |
| because it's not consistent with anything else in the |
| in the neighborhood. |
| MS. DWYER: And the smokestack and the big |
| square building were on the campus in '89; is that |
| correct? |
| MR. HERZSTEIN: Yes, that's right. |
| MG DIWITH All Control |
| MS. DWYER: All right. One other |
| question: on the photograph with the lights, the |
| |
| question: on the photograph with the lights, the |
| question: on the photograph with the lights, the evening lights and maybe this is Mr. Holmes' |
| question: on the photograph with the lights, the evening lights and maybe this is Mr. Holmes' testimony. |
| question: on the photograph with the lights, the evening lights and maybe this is Mr. Holmes' testimony. The lights that are shown in that |
| question: on the photograph with the lights, the evening lights and maybe this is Mr. Holmes' testimony. The lights that are shown in that photograph are not shining on your property, but |
| question: on the photograph with the lights, the evening lights and maybe this is Mr. Holmes' testimony. The lights that are shown in that photograph are not shining on your property, but rather they're shining in the distance. And your |
| question: on the photograph with the lights, the evening lights and maybe this is Mr. Holmes' testimony. The lights that are shown in that photograph are not shining on your property, but rather they're shining in the distance. And your point is that you can see them if you look out your |
| question: on the photograph with the lights, the evening lights and maybe this is Mr. Holmes' testimony. The lights that are shown in that photograph are not shining on your property, but rather they're shining in the distance. And your point is that you can see them if you look out your window? |
| |

| 1 | MS. HOLMES: Yes. Yes, you can see them |
|----|--|
| 2 | either from the outside or through the windows on that |
| 3 | side of our house. They're large, very large, windows |
| 4 | and the lights are bright. |
| 5 | MS. DWYER: Is this building also |
| 6 | approximately 400 feet from your property? |
| 7 | MS. HOLMES: Well, it depends on how you |
| 8 | measure the property. I noticed your lines, for |
| 9 | example, ran from Watkins to our building. And of |
| 10 | course, if you're in the yard, you might be in the |
| 11 | yard and you might be closer than that. I don't know |
| 12 | the exact feet. |
| 13 | MS. DWYER: Do you know what the depth of |
| 14 | your rear yard is? Is it 25 feet, 50 feet? |
| 15 | MS. HOLMES: The depth of our rear yard? |
| 16 | MS. DWYER: You're saying if you're in the |
| 17 | yard, you might be closer than the house. And I'm |
| 18 | just trying |
| 19 | MS. HOLMES: Well, the house the yard |
| 20 | goes right up to the line with the however wide the |
| 21 | field is, the playing field. |
| 22 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Her yard, at that point, |
| 23 | if you measured from the house to the boundary at that |
| 24 | point, it would probably be about 150 feet. |
| 25 | MS. DWYER: All right. |

| 1 | MR. HERZSTEIN: And the other thing about |
|----|---|
| 2 | those lights is, again, that they're not consistent |
| 3 | with anything else in the neighborhood. If there were |
| 4 | a house over there with its lights on, and there are |
| 5 | other houses around it, then you see a residential |
| 6 | view. But that's not what you see here. |
| 7 | MS. DWYER: Right. But isn't it fair to |
| 8 | say that when you have property that's close to a |
| 9 | university campus, what you're going to see is |
| 10 | somewhat different than what a residential |
| 11 | neighborhood would be? |
| 12 | MS. HOLMES: Not if the windows are |
| 13 | shielded, as they were supposed to be in our |
| 14 | agreement. |
| 15 | MS. DWYER: Have you proposed a way of |
| 16 | shielding these windows or a condition that would |
| 17 | allow shielding so that it does not present a problem |
| 18 | for you? |
| 19 | MS. HOLMES: I am not an engineer, but we |
| 20 | did have an engineer working with us. And he may have |
| 21 | worked with the University. The University came up |
| 22 | with its own plan. It had a couple of different plans |
| 23 | to shield the windows. I would think they should just |
| 24 | pull the shades, but it doesn't seem to be that |
| 25 | simple. |

| 1 | MS. DWYER: Yes, I think my understanding |
|----|--|
| 2 | is that the individuals who work in the building don't |
| 3 | often remember to pull the shades. So, they went to |
| 4 | an electronic system, and that occasionally |
| 5 | malfunctions, as I understand it. |
| 6 | MS. HOLMES: Yes, I think they've had |
| 7 | different problems. The students tell me, no, that's |
| 8 | used by artists, that part of the building, and they |
| 9 | don't need the lights. But they're on anyhow, so it's |
| 10 | very hard to say. |
| 11 | MS. DWYER: All right. Mr. Herzstein, I |
| 12 | have a couple of questions for you. |
| 13 | MR. HERZSTEIN: And I have a footnote on |
| 14 | that one. Trying to be practical, if there were |
| 15 | really dense landscape screening there, maybe that |
| 16 | would take care of it. And the University could leave |
| 17 | could not worry about the shades. |
| 18 | But until that landscaping is in, it's |
| 19 | it seems, to me, it's their responsibility to keep |
| 20 | either keep the lights off or have shades drawn. |
| 21 | There have been many nights when we call |
| 22 | up and the police, who are always very courteous, but |
| 23 | they don't seem to remember the previous occasion, |
| 24 | they say, "Okay, I'll go over there and check it." |
| 25 | And they call us back and they say, "Well, |

| 1 | there wasn't anyone in there," but they left the |
|----|--|
| 2 | lights on. It's just a matter of someone being a |
| 3 | little bit responsible someone taking |
| 4 | responsibility for this problem. |
| 5 | MS. DWYER: All right. A couple of other |
| 6 | questions for you; Mr. Herzstein back in approximately |
| 7 | February of 2000, when the University had formed this |
| 8 | working group, which I guess is about 14 months ago, |
| 9 | you were one of the members of the working group that |
| 10 | met with the University on the campus plan. Is that |
| 11 | correct? |
| 12 | MR. HERZSTEIN: That's right. |
| 13 | MS. DWYER: And at that time, did the |
| 14 | University provide you with a map showing all proposed |
| 15 | buildings, as well as the chart listing their sizes |
| 16 | and uses? |
| 17 | MR. HERZSTEIN: They did, I believe, at |
| 18 | the second meeting. The first meeting, where it was |
| 19 | sort of an organizational meeting where they talked |
| 20 | about procedures and some guiding principles, and at |
| 21 | that meeting, I said, "I hope that we're going to |
| 22 | proceed the way we did in 1988, not the way we did in |
| 23 | 1987." |
| 24 | Because in '88 is when they had the |
| 25 | successful effort that took the neighbors in early I |

1 told, "Yes, that's the way we're going to 2 proceed." 3 But then, the next week, or whenever the 4 next meeting was, a map was handed out, which is 5 essentially the same map that's now in the plan. 6 MS. DWYER: And that was approximately 7 February of 2000? MR. HERZSTEIN: I believe so. 8 9 And since that period of time, MS. DWYER: 10 had a chance to look at that list have you 11 buildings and to propose to the University changes to 12 the buildings or conditions on those buildings? MR. HERZSTEIN: of the 13 In most. 14 objectionable situations, didn't the we see 15 problem could be solved with conditions. We did 16 discuss our problems with the buildings. 17 We suggested -- we said that we didn't think certain buildings ought to be built. 18 There were 19 a number of occasions when we went around individual buildings or all the buildings and said what 20 21 recommended with respect to different ones. 22 But back in '89, when you met MS. DWYER: 23 with the University and went through a similar list of buildings, you were able to then support the plan on 24 25 the basis of conditions or parameters you put on those buildings. Is that correct?

MR. HERZSTEIN: Well, yes, but there, the actual placement of the buildings and which buildings were built and which weren't was decided after an extensive discussion with the neighbors about what their concerns were.

There was basically a start-from-scratch approach where Joe Brown, the -- who is now the head of EDA, and his people talked to the neighbors and said, "What are your concerns?"

They talked with the University, and then they started planning in order to meet the concerns of both parties. And we -- it still had some problems. And the negotiations went on for months. But they were all in a very -- for the most part, very constructive fashion.

They were led by -- from -- on the University side, by your then-partner Wayne Quinn. And Mr. Brown was the principal planner. And we were -- the University ended up dropping several of the buildings, as I recall it, which they felt there wasn't an immediate need for, and which were just sort of place-markers, including a large administration building west of where the arts center is now planned, and west of where the law school was

| | their prainted, at 45th and massachusetts. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MS. DWYER: Mr. Herzstein, if I could ask |
| 3 | you to be more direct in your answers |
| 4 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Okay, I thought I was |
| 5 | MS. DWYER: or we're going to run out |
| 6 | of time. |
| 7 | MR. HERZSTEIN: being direct. Okay. |
| 8 | MS. DWYER: When the University came to |
| 9 | you in January 2000 and said, "We're getting ready to |
| 10 | do our campus plan, and what we've done is look at the |
| 11 | '89 plan, the approximately the same building |
| 12 | locations, and proposed a series of buildings that, |
| 13 | when you compare the '89 and the 2000 plans, the |
| 14 | building locations are similar." |
| 15 | Now, perhaps the buildings aren't |
| 16 | identical, but the locations are similar. Is it your |
| 17 | testimony that when the University did that, and that |
| 18 | over the last 14 months, you have had no opportunity |
| 19 | to sit down and to express your concerns or suggest |
| 20 | conditions, or suggest that maybe a building be |
| 21 | reduced in size |
| 22 | MR. HERZSTEIN: No. |
| 23 | MS. DWYER: or eliminated; that the |
| 24 | process just did not allow you, in these weekly or |
| 25 | biweekly meetings, to have any input? |

1 MR. HERZSTEIN: To be very direct, the 2 question is that's answer to your no, not my testimony. 3 4 MS. DWYER: Then why, over the last 14 5 have you not proposed to the months, University 6 changes or conditions on these buildings that would 7 make it more palatable to you and your organization? MR. HERZSTEIN: We have tried to do so. Ι 8 9 think you could ask that question of various other neighbors. A number of neighbors sat through it. 10 think most of them would feel that we have made our 11 12 concerns very clear with respect to every building where we have a concern. 13 Have any of those concerns 14 MS. DWYER: been filed as conditions or recommendations in the 15 16 materials you have filed in the record? I thought 17 your filing said that you did not have conditions to offer at this time. 18 19 MR. HERZSTEIN: Well, we made our views -that's a separate question, I think you're asking. 20 21 made our views very clear to the University. They did not show up in the plan, as filed, or the conditions 22 23 that you have presented, except sometimes in a very general way where you say, "With respect to Building 24

A, we'll have ample buffering, or we'll put the air

| 1 | conditioner as far away as possible to limit the noise |
|----|--|
| 2 | as much as possible." |
| 3 | MS. DWYER: Well, then, let's look at |
| 4 | Building A. What would you suggest for Building A? |
| 5 | What are the conditions that you believe would address |
| 6 | your concerns for Building A? |
| 7 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Well, as you saw in my |
| 8 | papers of the last few days, we feel Building A |
| 9 | it's just we don't see a way to build Building A |
| 10 | without objectionable conditions. |
| 11 | MS. DWYER: Even though this is a location |
| 12 | that was in the '89 plan, you don't think any building |
| 13 | at this location could possibly be approved? |
| 14 | MR. HERZSTEIN: That's correct. |
| 15 | MS. DWYER: All right, as to Building B |
| 16 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Not possibly be approved? |
| 17 | No. I can't tell you what will be approved. We have |
| 18 | deep concerns that a building at Building A, when it |
| 19 | comes up for specific for further processing, that |
| 20 | you won't be able to assure that there will be |
| 21 | MS. DWYER: Excuse me, the University |
| 22 | won't or the Commission won't? |
| 23 | MR. HERZSTEIN: That the University won't |
| 24 | be able to establish that there will not be a serious |
| 25 | mechanical noise problem or a serious light and view |

| | problem |
|----|--|
| 2 | MS. DWYER: And you don't do you think |
| 3 | |
| 4 | MR. HERZSTEIN: for the neighbors next |
| 5 | to that building. Now, I don't want to get I'm not |
| 6 | an expert, and I can't get into the details of that. |
| 7 | But what I'm saying is that we didn't see any way we |
| 8 | could suggest conditions that would make that building |
| 9 | palatable. |
| 10 | MS. DWYER: Then what happens |
| 11 | MR. HERZSTEIN: But we do see where can |
| 12 | make suggested conditions. We will try to do so. We |
| 13 | have not had time to go through your conditions, and |
| 14 | compare them with the '89 plan and agreements, and |
| 15 | compare them with the current problems, and come up |
| 16 | with a definitive list of our own conditions. |
| 17 | We can try to do that sometime. And if |
| 18 | that's the direction the Commission goes in, of |
| 19 | course, we will we will do our best to submit |
| 20 | proposed conditions. |
| 21 | I'm telling you that one condition, with |
| 22 | respect to Building A, would be that it not be built. |
| 23 | MS. DWYER: Then my question is, what has |
| 24 | changed since 1989 to today, to reverse your position |
| 25 | of supporting a building at this location? |

1 MR. HERZSTEIN: Well, I think that we were 2 deeply concerned about that building in '89, very 3 deeply. There was about two or three pages 4 conditions put in at that time. 5 The reason we accepted it there, frankly, 6 is that it was a bargaining -- it was a bargain we had 7 to make in order to get the building at 45th and Massachusetts Avenue dropped, in order to get Building 8 9 A, which was much worse as initially proposed -- it 10 was initially going to be a performing arts center, with both the performing arts and the visual arts in 11 12 it. It was going to be much larger in the 1987 13 And as part of this exercise with Joe Brown and 14 15 his team, when we got the law school pared down, we 16 got the 45th and Massachusetts Avenue site dropped. 17 And then, with respect to Building A --CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think I'd really 18 19 like us to move along a little bit more quickly, if we 20 could. And I don't know, Ms. Dwyer, if you were 21 planning on going through each building and asking what conditions he was interested in. 22 23 Because I think the answer is they haven't -- they haven't gotten to that. 24

MR. HERZSTEIN:

25

The short answer to that

| 1 | is that we were very unhappy about it then, and didn't |
|----|--|
| 2 | think it could be done. But as part of the overall |
| 3 | bargain, we allowed it to go in. |
| 4 | MS. DWYER: All right. Well, I was |
| 5 | planning on walking through all the buildings, because |
| 6 | I think by the fourth hearing, the applicant and the |
| 7 | Commission has a right to hear what the specific |
| 8 | issues are for each of these buildings, rather than |
| 9 | general statements that they're not acceptable. |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Let me |
| 11 | MS. DWYER: But I |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Let me just let me |
| 13 | see if I can maybe cut through a little bit, which is, |
| 14 | Mr. Herzstein, in terms in response to a series of |
| 15 | questions that Ms. Dwyer might ask you, do you have |
| 16 | more specific conditions at the moment than those that |
| 17 | you have outlined in your testimony that we were able |
| 18 | to review? |
| 19 | MR. HERZSTEIN: No, I do not at the |
| 20 | moment. As I mentioned to you, we simply have not |
| 21 | felt we could that's a big project, and we simply |
| 22 | have not had time. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, Ms. Dwyer, did |
| 24 | you did you hear that response? |
| 25 | MS. DWYER: I did. |

1 MR. ELLIOTT: Madam Chair, also, prior to 2 these hearing, I met with Mr. Bastida for an hour and 3 And it was my understanding that after the be 4 hearings closed, there would period for 5 submissions of things the Commission wanted. 6 And then, after that would be a submission 7 of findings of fact, conclusions of law, which would include conditions. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, to the extent 10 that there's anything left over besides that, at the 11 conclusion of this hearing, yes. But within the 12 context of proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, you can propose conditions. 13 It's just that in the context of -- or in 14 15 an effort to try and reach some agreement, you know, 16 through this process, I think the University would 17 have found it helpful if they knew what those were in advance, instead of finding them out when it's really 18 19 too late to respond. 20 MS. DWYER: And Madam Chair, I make that 21 because in Mr. Herzstein's statement filing, suggested that perhaps -- that the Board should take a 22 23 break, have the parties draft conditions, file them, and then have hearings on the conditions. 24

had

that

been

done

And

if

25

at

the

1 beginning, then tonight's hearing could be a focused 2 hearing on what Building A needs in order to address community concerns. 3 4 Ι have one final question for Mr. Herzstein, and that was to ask him whether any of the 5 6 neighbors along Woodway Lane or University 7 Avenue have requested the kind of landscaping buffering you have requested for your property? 8 9 HERZSTEIN: Well, we are --MR. 10 mentioned at the very first hearing, we're in 11 unusual situation. We're on the highest point of land 12 in that area. And we have the longest -- we have a 450 foot boundary with the University. 13 think our condition 14 So, Ι is very 15 different. The other neighbors on Woodway Lane are 16 very interested in this proceeding. But none of them has the kind of exposure. They're all lower. 17 As you come up to our house from Woodway 18 19 Lane, you go up a hill. The other neighbors are all 20 lower, so they don't have that problem. 21 On University Avenue, I think you will be hearing from witnesses who have concerns about that. 22 23 landscaping bit Everyone's needs are little 24 different than everyone else's. So, they're 25 asking kind, for the but they same are

| 1 | dissatisfied with the or, they are dissatisfied |
|----|--|
| 2 | with the current condition there. |
| 3 | MS. DWYER: But they haven't requested |
| 4 | landscaping or buffering by their properties? |
| 5 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Oh, I think they have, |
| 6 | yes. On University? |
| 7 | MS. DWYER: Yes, the other property |
| 8 | owners. Can you indicate, for the record, which ones |
| 9 | have requested this landscaping on their property? |
| 10 | MR. HERZSTEIN: On their property? |
| 11 | MS. DWYER: Right, the property that |
| 12 | the properties that border the University, has anyone |
| 13 | |
| 14 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Yes, I think you'll be |
| 15 | hearing from Mr. Paul |
| 16 | MS. DWYER: One final question, in and |
| 17 | this is for Ms. Holmes. In your testimony, you |
| 18 | referred to a photograph showing cars parked on an |
| 19 | area of the campus. And I just wanted to confirm that |
| 20 | you I think you went on to say that in the |
| 21 | University's latest filing with the not the chain |
| 22 | link fence, but whatever the vehicular barrier is that |
| 23 | the University is proposing, that that condition would |
| 24 | be remedied, and that it would not there would not |
| 25 | be access provided to that area under what we are |

25

| 1 | proposing. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MS. HOLMES: I think you're proposing |
| 3 | chain link barrier at the two ends of the circular |
| 4 | drive. Is that correct? Because from your drawing, I |
| 5 | couldn't tell. Part of your drawing was off the page. |
| 6 | I couldn't see if the second part of the links was |
| 7 | there or not the barrier. |
| 8 | And this is a temporary matter until the |
| 9 | road is abandoned. Is that correct? |
| 10 | MS. DWYER: That is correct. The road is |
| 11 | planned to be abandoned, and it is temporary. But the |
| 12 | idea was to have a barrier that would prevent any |
| 13 | faculty, staff or student cars, or contractors from |
| 14 | accessing that area. |
| 15 | MS. HOLMES: Absolutely. |
| 16 | MS. DWYER: All right, thank you. That's |
| 17 | all for those two. I do have some question for Ms. |
| 18 | Heynes (sic), the architect. I think it's Heynes |
| 19 | Heyne. |
| 20 | Ms. Heyne, just a couple of questions; |
| 21 | you seem to indicate that one of your concerns or |
| 22 | you did indicate that one of your concerns about the |
| 23 | building was the length of the building. |
| 24 | And isn't it true that the building, |
| 25 | however, is broken up into three pieces, with a plaza |

| 1 | separating two of them in order to reduce the visual |
|----|--|
| 2 | appearance of the length of the building? |
| 3 | MS. HEYNE: It still is one long building. |
| 4 | And even though there is a slight indentation there, |
| 5 | the central plaza is of such a large scale the |
| 6 | whole thing still reads as one large building. |
| 7 | The indentations are not very substantial, |
| 8 | in my mind. |
| 9 | MS. DWYER: You raised a concern about |
| LO | handicap accessibility to the building. And isn't it |
| L1 | true that the grade of the sidewalk near Ward Circle |
| L2 | matches the elevation of the plaza, so that there is |
| L3 | handicap accessibility? |
| L4 | MS. HEYNE: That's probably where they |
| L5 | would, indeed, have to go in. It would if they're |
| L6 | coming across the road from the University, then they |
| L7 | would, of course, have to traverse up the sidewalk and |
| L8 | go in. |
| L9 | You know, it will be a little bit |
| 20 | inconvenient, I think, for a lot of handicapped |
| 21 | people. |
| 22 | MS. DWYER: Are you aware of the number of |
| 23 | times the architectural team has met with the |
| 24 | community to review the design? Do you have any idea |
| 25 | whether it they did meet with the community, like |

1 say, 37 times over the last year and a half, showing 2 different alternatives? 3 MS. HEYNE: I have not been told the 4 precise number of times, but I have been told that the 5 amount of visual information has been inadequate. And 6 the response -- as well, the response is on 7 boards. MS. DWYER: Are you familiar with the 8 9 number of changes that have been made to the building as a result of these meetings and community input? 10 11 MS. HEYNE: There's a -- yes, I am aware 12 that one of the floors was removed. The result of that -- or, rather, it's a series of offices, perhaps 13 it may be a small space, because actually -- I think 14 15 there were actually classrooms that were removed --16 removed. 17 And the result of that, though, was there was a corridor remaining, which, once again, is a 18 19 rather inefficient -- the building is inefficient. 20 extra corridors that, with And there are 21 compression, these extra corridors redesign, some could be easily eliminated. 22 MS. DWYER: One of the other issues you 23 raised, I think, was a concern about the number of 24 25 light wells in the building. And are you aware that

| 1 | part of the intent of the design of the building was |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 2 | to reduce the fenestration on the north side to |
| 3 | minimize the impact on the neighbors, and therefore |
| 4 | providing these light wells and atrium spaces as a way |
| 5 | of day-lighting the interior? |
| 6 | MS. HEYNE: I realize that. But it seems |
| 7 | to me that if the building were more efficiently |
| 8 | designed, these various wings would be further away |
| 9 | from the neighbors. And there could be a more |
| 10 | variegated facade treatment, and perhaps even |
| 11 | occasionally northern windows or northern-sloped, |
| 12 | upper-sloped windows could be introduced. |
| 13 | There are many ways of handling it. In my |
| 14 | estimation my mother is a professional portrait |
| | |
| 15 | painter. In my estimation, most artists tend to want |
| 15 16 | painter. In my estimation, most artists tend to want northern light anyway. |
| | northern light anyway. |
| 16 | northern light anyway. And I think the needs of the artistic |
| 16 17 | northern light anyway. And I think the needs of the artistic community there are not always well served. And of |
| 16 17 18 | |
| 16 17 18 19 | northern light anyway. And I think the needs of the artistic community there are not always well served. And of course, the effect of also having these walls is, of |
| 16 17 18 19 20 | northern light anyway. And I think the needs of the artistic community there are not always well served. And of course, the effect of also having these walls is, of course, to create sort of a stalag kind of atmosphere |
| 16 17 18 19 20 21 | northern light anyway. And I think the needs of the artistic community there are not always well served. And of course, the effect of also having these walls is, of course, to create sort of a stalag kind of atmosphere for the neighbors. |

MS. DWYER: In your opinion, would it be

25

| | preferable to have windows on the real side of the |
|----|---|
| 2 | building, facing the neighbors? |
| 3 | MS. HEYNE: I think the building needs a |
| 4 | lot of redesign and needs compression. And it needs |
| 5 | to go back to the drawing board, in my estimation. |
| 6 | MS. DWYER: Do you know what the height of |
| 7 | the building is? |
| 8 | MS. HEYNE: The height varies, of course, |
| 9 | depending on where you are. On the plaza side, during |
| 10 | measuring it from the |
| 11 | MS. DWYER: Measuring it under the zoning |
| 12 | regulations? |
| 13 | MS. HEYNE: Are we measuring it from the |
| 14 | sidewalk? Are we measuring it from the |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I believe Ms. Dwyer |
| 16 | said we're measuring it |
| 17 | MS. HEYNE: plaza? |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: from the zoning |
| 19 | regulations. |
| 20 | MS. DWYER: Under the zoning regulations. |
| 21 | You don't and just off-hand, do you know that the |
| 22 | height is within the 40-foot matter-of-right height |
| 23 | for a residential district? |
| 24 | MS. HEYNE: I believe that yes, that is |
| 25 | the that is the case. |

| 1 | MS. DWYER: And do you know that one of |
|----|--|
| 2 | the concessions or changes made to the building was to |
| 3 | include, within the 40-foot height, the mechanical |
| 4 | penthouse, so that there is not an additional |
| 5 | penthouse above that? |
| 6 | MS. HEYNE: That is correct. |
| 7 | MS. DWYER: Do you think that is a |
| 8 | plus in terms of the building design, to be able to |
| 9 | place that mechanical equipment inside the building, |
| 10 | and stay within the same 40-foot matter-of-right |
| 11 | height? |
| 12 | MS. HEYNE: Well, even though there is a |
| 13 | mechanical penthouse that, of course, hides some |
| 14 | mechanical equipment, it does result in a big bump-up, |
| 15 | the big rotunda. And so, that's where much of the |
| 16 | mechanical equipment is. And that's one of the most |
| 17 | irritating aspects of the building. |
| 18 | Additionally, as I mentioned earlier, the |
| 19 | large wall on the plaza level is not really doing |
| 20 | anything. |
| 21 | MS. DWYER: Turning for a minute to the |
| 22 | waterscape and landscaping features, you don't believe |
| 23 | that that open landscaped plaza area is in keeping |
| 24 | with the significant comprehensive plan, urban design |
| 25 | policies for Massachusetts Avenue? |

| | ms. HEINE: One can rook at the randscape |
|----|--|
| 2 | in isolation, possibly. But one has to it would be |
| 3 | better to look at it in the context of the entire |
| 4 | building. |
| 5 | MS. DWYER: And one final question; your |
| 6 | testimony relates to the physical character or |
| 7 | architecture of the building. You have not, I assume, |
| 8 | done any study of the programmatic needs of an arts |
| 9 | center in terms of the spaces needed inside for |
| 10 | academics or studio space? |
| 11 | MS. HEYNE: There is, as I indicated |
| 12 | before, an inordinately large amount of space devoted |
| 13 | to corridors and light wells, gathering spaces. And |
| 14 | as I note in the site plan, this is supposed to be |
| 15 | strictly an academic building. |
| 16 | And yet, there is an awful lot of student |
| 17 | life space, as far as I'm concerned, in this building. |
| 18 | MS. DWYER: And would student life not be |
| 19 | part of academic space? |
| 20 | MS. HEYNE: I think, to a certain extent, |
| 21 | it is. But perhaps, you don't need such a large light |
| 22 | well that protrudes into the neighbors' yards the way |
| 23 | the one on the the panel shows on the left. |
| 24 | MS. DWYER: One more question, what |
| 25 | percentage of the building is devoted to the corridors |

| 1 | and light wells that you say is so inefficient, or are |
|----|--|
| 2 | so inefficient? |
| 3 | MS. HEYNE: I can provide that information |
| 4 | at a later time if somebody wants the precise |
| 5 | percentage. |
| 6 | MS. DWYER: Approximately, since you've |
| 7 | indicated that that's an issue that you've identified, |
| 8 | you must have an approximate number. |
| 9 | MS. HEYNE: I would rather not guess. I |
| 10 | have looked at this with colleagues in my office, and |
| 11 | we have all agreed that this building could be |
| 12 | compressed. But I would be very happy to count the |
| 13 | various spaces and get that percentage. |
| 14 | MS. DWYER: I don't need that presented to |
| 15 | the record. I'm just curious if you keep raising as |
| 16 | an issue the number of the the amount of light well |
| 17 | and corridor space and the inefficiency of the |
| 18 | building, that you would have an idea of what that |
| 19 | percentage is. But if you don't, that's fine. |
| 20 | MS. HEYNE: Once again, I will give you |
| 21 | that I could give you that information. |
| 22 | MS. DWYER: That's fine. I don't I |
| 23 | don't need that file, thank you. |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anything else? |
| 25 | MS. DWYER: No, that's it. |

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Very good. Anyone |
|----|--|
| 2 | here from ANC-3D? Oh, Ms. Hamilton, I didn't see you |
| 3 | there. Come on up. Did you have some cross |
| 4 | examination? |
| 5 | MS. HAMILTON: Not right now. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. DiBiase I |
| 7 | didn't see Ms. Quynn. Oh, is she here? Okay. Do you |
| 8 | have any cross examination? Come on up. |
| 9 | MR. DiBIASE: May I sit with my colleague? |
| 10 | I don't think I |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sure, you can sit |
| 12 | with her. |
| 13 | MS. QUYNN: Mr. Bilecky, there were two |
| 14 | traffic studies that were done as part of the plan. |
| 15 | Do you know why that was, or what the reason was for |
| 16 | two studies? |
| 17 | MR. BILECKY: I can offer my conjecture. |
| 18 | Really the three |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'd rather not have |
| 20 | you guess about it. If you don't know the answer, |
| 21 | then and I assume this relates to your written |
| 22 | testimony that we didn't hear you present orally. |
| 23 | MS. QUYNN: Yes. |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But if you don't know |
| 25 | the answer, please don't guess about the answer. |

| 1 | MR. BILECKY: Then I know the answer. |
|----|--|
| 2 | (Laughter.) |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Just remember you |
| 4 | stood up and took the little oath. |
| 5 | MR. BILECKY: I know I know the answer. |
| 6 | (Laughter.) |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Go ahead, go ahead. |
| 8 | MR. BILECKY: I wrote a three-page |
| 9 | critique of the first traffic study that was submitted |
| LO | in the original filing of the campus plan, and it was |
| L1 | filed in August. I sent my three-page critique to AU; |
| _2 | I believe it was dated September 7th. |
| L3 | I got a written response back from AU and |
| L4 | their traffic consultant. And I cited and what my |
| L5 | critique essentially did was point out the numerous |
| L6 | flaws, contradictions and errors in the originally- |
| L7 | submitted study. |
| L8 | And that was simple math, simple counting |
| L9 | cars, simple integrating of their movements and their |
| 20 | calculations, and then showing that their conclusions |
| 21 | did not gel with what their math should have told |
| 22 | them. |
| 23 | The result was that AU commissioned a peer |
| 24 | review, as they explained it to us, to review that |
| 25 | original study. And the result was a completely |

| 1 | revised submission that was delivered on December |
|----|--|
| 2 | 11th. |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
| 4 | MS. QUYNN: Okay. And then, what what |
| 5 | was the date of the original hearing? Was it the |
| 6 | 12th? |
| 7 | MR. BILECKY: Yes, it was. |
| 8 | MS. QUYNN: Okay. So, perhaps part of the |
| 9 | reason why the first hearing was postponed was to give |
| 10 | the community representatives more than a day to look |
| 11 | at the second traffic study. |
| 12 | MR. BILECKY: That's conjecture. |
| 13 | (Laughter.) |
| 14 | MS. QUYNN: Okay, okay. Are there any |
| 15 | specific points that you feel the study didn't take |
| 16 | into consideration, the second the second study? |
| 17 | MR. BILECKY: Yes, and a couple of points |
| 18 | have been made through cross examine (sic). I believe |
| 19 | at the last hearing, the Zoning Commission directed |
| 20 | the traffic consultant or AU to address or redress the |
| 21 | issue of the traffic signal manipulation on the Glover |
| 22 | gate where they use the ten-second crosswalk. |
| 23 | I don't know that that's been done. We |
| 24 | have not seen the revised study with that work. But |
| 25 | the point that I made in the original September 7th |

| 1 | critique was that pedestrian impacts weren't included, |
|----|--|
| 2 | and actual traffic movements were not analyzed. |
| 3 | They analyzed one thing in the technical |
| 4 | appendix, and then stated another thing in the soft, |
| 5 | front end of the manual. And so, it's my the |
| 6 | current study that came in, in on December 11th |
| 7 | still is extremely flawed in that it allows left turns |
| 8 | off of Massachusetts Avenue into the campus and into |
| 9 | the arts center, which are contrary to DPW's |
| LO | recommendations. |
| L1 | It does not include pedestrians, and it |
| L2 | has traffic signal manipulation that is not consistent |
| L3 | with the way that intersection is supposed to work. |
| L4 | MS. QUYNN: Thank you. That's all that I |
| L5 | have. |
| L6 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Bilecky, is that |
| L7 | outlined in your written testimony? |
| L8 | MR. BILECKY: Yes. |
| L9 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, thank you. |
| 20 | MS. DWYER: I have a question I'd like to |
| 21 | ask. |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sure. |
| 23 | MS. DWYER: Mr. Bilecky, you're not a |
| 24 | traffic engineer, are you? |
| 25 | MR. BILECKY: Oh, I've been waiting for |

| 1 | this one. |
|----|---|
| 2 | (Laughter.) |
| 3 | MS. DWYER: Go ahead. |
| 4 | MR. BILECKY: No. And if the study is so |
| 5 | flawed that a common citizen can find the errors |
| 6 | (Laughter, applause.) |
| 7 | MS. DWYER: Were the conclusions in the |
| 8 | second traffic study the same as in the first? |
| 9 | MR. BILECKY: Mostly. There were some |
| 10 | changes and some LOS's changed. Some traffic counts |
| 11 | changed. But again, the conclusions of the first were |
| 12 | as flawed as the second. |
| 13 | MS. DWYER: So, you disagree with both |
| 14 | traffic studies. Do you also disagree with DPW's |
| 15 | report of |
| 16 | MR. BILECKY: I believe DP yes, DPW |
| 17 | and I've spoke to DPW, that they have not done a |
| 18 | dutiful review of the technical appendix. If they |
| 19 | only review the front end of the traffic study and do |
| 20 | not go into the detail, which they did not do, of the |
| 21 | technical appendix, where all the counts are that |
| 22 | generate the dialogue in the front of the book, those |
| 23 | two conflict. |
| 24 | MS. DWYER: Those are all the questions I |
| 25 | have. |

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. ELLIOTT: Would you state your |
| 3 | profession? |
| 4 | MR. BILECKY: I'm a professional old |
| 5 | mechanical engineer. |
| 6 | MR. ELLIOTT: Thank you. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
| 8 | MS. HAMILTON: Now, can I |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sure, come on. |
| 10 | MS. HAMILTON: I have a |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Turn on your mic |
| 12 | there. State your name for the record, just the first |
| 13 | time. |
| 14 | MS. HAMILTON: Tonya Hamilton, Advisory |
| 15 | Neighborhood Commission 3D. I have a question for Mr. |
| 16 | Herzstein. A few minutes ago, one of the questions |
| 17 | presented to you was during our 14 months of hearings |
| 18 | with or meetings, weekly, biweekly, with the |
| 19 | University, were there specific suggestions made at |
| 20 | some of those meetings from the citizens to the |
| 21 | University about changes that might be made to |
| 22 | specific buildings? |
| 23 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Yes, there were. |
| 24 | MS. HAMILTON: And what was the |
| 25 | University's response to those suggestions? |

| 1 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Well, it was very rare |
|----|---|
| 2 | that we got any response. There would be sort of a |
| 3 | silence. And then, the next week, we would go on to |
| 4 | another subject. |
| 5 | Sometimes, it was an explanation of why it |
| 6 | couldn't be done. Let's take Building K, for example, |
| 7 | which we said was we felt was much too high, and |
| 8 | was going to hurt the quality of Massachusetts Avenue |
| 9 | badly. |
| 10 | There was a plat that came in with a |
| 11 | couple of alterative drawings as to how it might be |
| 12 | done. But that was that was the response, as I |
| 13 | recall it. |
| 14 | In other cases, like the bleachers, we |
| 15 | said that's not something that we think can be |
| 16 | consistent with the neighboring community. And we got |
| 17 | no response on that. |
| 18 | MS. HAMILTON: Thank you. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
| 20 | MS. DWYER: Mr. Herzstein, you mentioned |
| 21 | Building K. When the University first proposed |
| 22 | Building K, until the present application, what it |
| 23 | has been reduced in size, has it not? |
| 24 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Well, yes |
| 25 | MS. DWYER: By about by about how many |

| 1 | square feet, about 30,000? |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Oh, I thought the I |
| 3 | thought the first one was so ridiculous, it wasn't |
| 4 | even in my mind. When I mentioned Building K, I was |
| 5 | talking about the currently proposed Building K. I |
| 6 | think |
| 7 | MS. DWYER: But that's there was a |
| 8 | previous building that was 30,000 |
| 9 | MR. HERZSTEIN: I think they're |
| 10 | MS. DWYER: square feet larger, and it |
| 11 | was reduced as a result of community input. Was the |
| 12 | height of that building reduced from 80 feet to 50 |
| 13 | feet, as a result of the community meeting process? |
| 14 | MR. HERZSTEIN: I don't remember. |
| 15 | MS. DWYER: All right. |
| 16 | MR. HERZSTEIN: It may have been. I think |
| 17 | the original Building K, as I recall it, came right |
| 18 | down to Mass. Avenue and had a had an access for |
| 19 | cars into it from that side. And that |
| 20 | MS. DWYER: But the point is, that it |
| 21 | changed as a result of |
| 22 | MR. HERZSTEIN: Yes, okay. |
| 23 | MS. DWYER: comments made by the |
| 24 | community |
| 25 | MR. HERZSTEIN: I'll grant you that. |

| Τ | MS. DWYER: during the meeting process. |
|----|--|
| 2 | Thank you. |
| 3 | MR. HERZSTEIN: That one changed, not very |
| 4 | far not satisfactorily, but it changed. |
| 5 | MS. DWYER: Okay, thank you. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We'd like to do our |
| 7 | assessment now. And I think I'd like Mr. Wilson or |
| 8 | yes, Mr. Wilson to come were you done, Ms. |
| 9 | Hamilton? |
| 10 | MS. HAMILTON: May I ask another question? |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, sorry about |
| 12 | that. |
| 13 | MS. HAMILTON: Moving from Building K, |
| 14 | were there other specific suggestions made about other |
| 15 | buildings from the citizens to the University? |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Ms. Hamilton, just |
| 17 | why do you want to go through this? I mean, what we |
| 18 | have generally gathered is that there have been some |
| 19 | suggestions made that were taken, either in whole or |
| 20 | in part, by the applicant, and then some suggestions |
| 21 | by the community have been ignored. |
| 22 | MS. HAMILTON: I just wondered if that |
| 23 | needed more elaboration. |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No. I think, at this |
| 25 | point, the answer to that is no, if that's all right |

1 with you. Thank you. Now, we'll have Mr. Wilson come 2 up and help us do our assessment. We're going to give you ten minutes to do 3 4 -- to present your case in opposition. And you don't 5 have the benefit of having been here through the 6 original cross examination. But you know, we would 7 like maintain а balance between the direct to testimony and the cross examination. 8 9 And we're sort of -- we've achieved that balance. So, do you have a relatively brief cross 10 examination for the applicant or --11 12 MR. WILSON: Well, I can't tell you that it's going to be as brief as the presentation about 13 Tenley Campus, because that presentation 14 15 essentially non-existent. 16 I have significant ground to cover about 17 Tenley Campus, because there the has been no presentation about the Tenley Campus. 18 And there are 19 many things in the campus plan that have been utterly ignored, and that are incredibly important to me and 20 21 to my neighbors. 22 I cannot tell you that I will have less 23 than maybe half an hour or 45 minutes. But I don't know what kind of answers I'm going to get either. 24

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:

25

And are you going to

| _ | be confining your questions to the Tenley Campus? |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. WILSON: Correct, that is all. |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right, just bear |
| 4 | with me a second. |
| 5 | MR. WILSON: Sure. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: If we could come back |
| 7 | to order? We're going to try and beat get a |
| 8 | cooperative effort towards being fair to everyone. |
| 9 | What's been suggested is we've had these nice people |
| 10 | who want to testify come back many times. |
| 11 | And I know that Ms. Dwyer had her panel of |
| 12 | folks come back specifically to be cross examined |
| 13 | tonight. If we were to allow the persons in |
| 14 | opposition to testify tonight, and then we would |
| 15 | reschedule you to the 30th of April |
| 16 | SECRETARY BASTIDA: That is correct, Madam |
| 17 | Chairman. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: could you bring |
| 19 | your folks back for a cross examination? |
| 20 | MS. DWYER: Number one, we can bring them |
| 21 | back because they would be back anyway for rebuttal. |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 23 | MS. DWYER: We do we have rebuttal. |
| 24 | So, that's not the problem. The problem is the date. |
| 25 | There's a conflict with April 30th with American |
| | |

| 1 | University with George Abud. And I haven't checked |
|----|--|
| 2 | with the other people on the team. |
| 3 | Is there any possibility of an earlier |
| 4 | hearing date than April 30th? |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We'll see what Mr. |
| 6 | Bastida has. |
| 7 | SECRETARY BASTIDA: That's a possibility. |
| 8 | My concern is that Mr. Elliott has told me that he |
| 9 | has previous engagements. Basically, he is |
| 10 | unavailable until the 30th. |
| 11 | MS. DWYER: Is there any perhaps Mr. |
| 12 | Herzstein could ask the questions in his absence? |
| 13 | We're talking about limited questions of any rebuttal, |
| 14 | as opposed to the major portion of our testimony. |
| 15 | But waiting until April 30th, or in this |
| 16 | case, it would have to be May because of the conflict |
| 17 | with the applicant, is a significant loss of time. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, Mr. Elliott, |
| 19 | work with us here. |
| 20 | MR. ELLIOTT: I can be how about the |
| 21 | Thursday after the 30th? I'm here that week. I have |
| 22 | severe problems up until then that's |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's not working |
| 24 | with the rest of the folks on the panel. |
| 25 | MR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Abud's |

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, now, it would |
|----|--|
| 2 | someone else that would have a problem. |
| 3 | MR. ELLIOTT: I see. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, we need you to be |
| 5 | |
| 6 | MS. DWYER: Is there a prior date, Mr. |
| 7 | Elliott? Is there a prior time in the month of April |
| 8 | that you would be available? |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Or that you would, |
| 10 | you know, deputize someone to ask the questions in |
| 11 | your in your absence? |
| 12 | MR. ELLIOTT: It would probably be another |
| 13 | counsel, which is very difficult in a thing this |
| 14 | complex. |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Take two minutes and |
| 16 | confer. And then, I mean, we'll really I mean, we |
| 17 | really would like to accommodate the folks that have |
| 18 | come down repeatedly |
| 19 | MR. ELLIOTT: Yes, of course. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: and so we and |
| 21 | Ms. Dwyer has been very generous in providing the |
| 22 | opportunity for Mr. Wilson to cross examine these |
| 23 | folks. Now, one alternative, I suppose, would be if |
| 24 | we stuck with the 30th, and Mr. Wilson submitted |
| 25 | questions for Mr. Abud to answer in writing. |

| 1 | MS. DWYER: Well, Mr. Abud is giving part |
|----|---|
| 2 | of the rebuttal testimony |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 4 | MS. DWYER: so he'll be giving direct |
| 5 | testimony. I think for the University, their key |
| 6 | person who has been involved in this process really |
| 7 | needs to be there. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I keep |
| 9 | forgetting about the rebuttal part. |
| 10 | MS. DWYER: No date earlier than any |
| 11 | chance you can fly back from or teleconference, |
| 12 | video-conference? |
| 13 | MR. ELLIOTT: Well, this it's just very |
| 14 | difficult for me, Madam Chair, to come prior to that |
| 15 | date. |
| 16 | COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Ms. Dwyer, I don't |
| 17 | think I heard a real explanation of what's wrong with |
| 18 | May 3rd, the Thursday of that week, from your |
| 19 | perspective. |
| 20 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I agree with you, |
| 21 | Mr. Parsons. I think, if I can just interject I've |
| 22 | been sitting we've been accommodating all this |
| 23 | time. I think we should accommodate especially the |
| 24 | counsel for to return on one of those dates. |
| 25 | I just think that if we're going to make |

| 1 | we've been accommodating all this time |
|----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: How about May 3rd? |
| 3 | Is May 3rd no good? |
| 4 | MS. DWYER: Let me check with can we |
| 5 | maybe take a two minute break and I can find out? |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, sure, sure. |
| 7 | That's good. |
| 8 | MS. DWYER: Thank you. |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, two |
| 10 | minutes. |
| 11 | (Whereupon, the proceedings went off the |
| 12 | record at 9:59 p.m. and resumed at 10:04 p.m.) |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Come back to order, |
| 14 | please. Perhaps you didn't hear me. Please take your |
| 15 | seats. Ms. Dwyer or Mr. Elliott, have you come up |
| 16 | with anything? |
| 17 | MR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Herzstein is going to be |
| 18 | in Mexico, and it's his work, trade work, that week of |
| 19 | the 23rd. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'm going to ask you |
| 21 | all to please sit down and be quiet. |
| 22 | MR. ELLIOTT: Ms. Dwyer says that the |
| 23 | primary problem is Mr. Kleinrock has some appearance |
| 24 | out of town on the 30th. We haven't been able to work |
| 25 | anything out. |

1 MS. DWYER: Madame Chair, I wanted to 2 first state that I think that the University, case, 3 Applicant in this has been more 4 accommodating. This application was filed in August. 5 We postponed our December hearings in order to allow 6 facilitation, and we've had two months of hearings. 7 At this point, it is very prejudicial to the University's plans in going forward with this 8 9 project to delay it for a month, which is what it 10 sounds like will happen, because if the 30th does not work for the University and its architectural team 11 12 that week. The following week, as I understand it, doesn't work for Mr. Herzstein, and we're in the 13 middle of May. 14 I would submit that there is some date in 15 16 April that Mr. Elliott could get someone else from his 17 If we were in the middle of a court trial, office. the court would not say everything is 18 suspended 19 because the attorney has other commitments. You have 20 You have someone else step in, and I think 21 that we need that accommodation now. 22 MR. ELLIOTT: It's a little confusing

> NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

be out of the country, not the week after.

23

24

It's the week before where he'll

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, well within the

about Mr. Herzstein.

| 1 | time frame that we'd like to work in, which is the |
|----|--|
| 2 | month of April, what's remaining in the month of |
| 3 | April, I need you to come up with a plan that will |
| 4 | allow us to go forward within the month of April. |
| 5 | MR. ELLIOTT: And April 30th is out |
| 6 | because of Mr. Kleinrock. I mean, I'm sure we'll |
| 7 | finish at the next hearing. |
| 8 | MS. DWYER: Mr. Abud. |
| 9 | MR. ELLIOTT: Oh, Mr. Abud on the 30th. |
| 10 | Couldn't someone substitute for him? |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: He's part of their |
| 12 | rebuttal. |
| 13 | MR. ELLIOTT: I mean, they have |
| 14 | MS. DWYER: Mr. Elliott, is there another |
| 15 | date in April was the question. Is there another? |
| 16 | MR. ELLIOTT: Well, when we take into |
| 17 | account Mr. Herzstein's schedule and mine, I mean, |
| 18 | we're definitely back to prior to the 23rd. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Bastida, what do |
| 20 | we have prior to the 23rd available? |
| 21 | MR. BASTIDA: Well, we could do it on the |
| 22 | 19th or on the 23rd. |
| 23 | MR. ELLIOTT: The 23rd is impossible for |
| 24 | Mr. Herzstein. |
| 25 | MR. BASTIDA: How about the 19th? |

| | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: The 19th? |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. ELLIOTT: I'm sorry. |
| 3 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: The 19th? |
| 4 | MR. ELLIOTT: I probably will not be here. |
| 5 | I think you just have to decide this. Every single |
| 6 | date has conflicts. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, and we're laying |
| 8 | it on you to decide. Pick a day in April and decide |
| 9 | how you're going to deal with the fact that if, in |
| 10 | fact, you can't be there, how you're going to handle |
| 11 | that. |
| 12 | MR. ELLIOTT: Well, then I just refer to |
| 13 | Mr. Herzstein's schedule. He can't be here the week |
| 14 | of the 23rd. |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. |
| 16 | MR. ELLIOTT: And I have conflicts earlier |
| 17 | than that. So, I guess the Commission will, if you |
| 18 | choose a date earlier than the 23rd, you will have to |
| 19 | select the date and see what happens. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. I'm going |
| 21 | to propose the date of April 19. |
| 22 | SECRETARY BASTIDA: That is available, |
| 23 | Madame Chairman. |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Does that work with |
| 25 | the commissioners? |

| 1 | SECRETARY BASTIDA: That's a Thursday. |
|----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Does that work? |
| 3 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I don't know. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What are your |
| 5 | concerns? |
| 6 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I just think that, |
| 7 | you know, we've been accommodating all the way, so I |
| 8 | mean you know, might as well continue. That's just my |
| 9 | opinion. I understand. Ms. Dwyer, let me ask you, |
| 10 | what is the urgency? |
| 11 | MS. DWYER: The urgency is that they have |
| 12 | a donor and are ready to go forward with further |
| 13 | processing for the arts center, and they delayed the |
| 14 | filing of the campus plan as a result of meetings with |
| 15 | the community. They delayed their first hearing date, |
| 16 | and at some point, they need to move forward with |
| 17 | their plans. |
| 18 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madame Chair, I |
| 19 | will defer to you. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I mean, the |
| 21 | University has accommodated the requests by the |
| 22 | community for postponement, and we're just trying to |
| 23 | bring this to closure, and we'd also like to get |
| 24 | through the persons in opposition tonight. So, I |
| 25 | would like to just get some closure on this discussion |

| 1 | about when we're going to reschedule. |
|----|---|
| 2 | VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's fine with |
| 3 | me. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is that all right? |
| 5 | MS. DWYER: All right. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Seven p.m. |
| 7 | MS. DWYER: Thank you. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, Mr. Wilson, |
| 9 | you'll have a little longer opportunity then to |
| 10 | prepare questions on cross examination. |
| 11 | Mr. Bastida informs me that we have two |
| 12 | students from the University who are here, and they |
| 13 | are not persons in opposition. We've already had |
| 14 | persons in support. So, if the students want to |
| 15 | submit written testimony, we'd be happy to receive |
| 16 | that, but we're not going to go back. This is why we |
| 17 | can't really seem to get moving through this case is |
| 18 | because we keep taking detours. So, that's one detour |
| 19 | we're not going to take, but we would be more than |
| 20 | happy to receive that written testimony. |
| 21 | If you're going to speak, then you need to |
| 22 | come to the microphone. Identify yourself for the |
| 23 | record, please. |
| 24 | MR. HURST: Okay. My name is Michael |
| 25 | Hurst, Advisory Neighborhood Commissioner, 3D-07. I |

| 1 | just want to testify based on my views from the Office |
|----|--|
| 2 | of Planning report, my experience with the ANC |
| 3 | meetings, and other information like that. So, I just |
| 4 | wanted to testify based on the interest of my |
| 5 | constituents, who actually live on the American |
| 6 | University campus. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But you consider |
| 8 | yourself a person in opposition? |
| 9 | MR. HURST: It would be conditional |
| LO | support. Basically, it's sort of along the lines of |
| L1 | the Office of Planning report, conditional support, a |
| L2 | few changes here and there. |
| L3 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, that's support. |
| L4 | So, I'm just going to ask you to submit that |
| L5 | testimony in writing because we've already had the |
| L6 | opportunity for persons in support, and we have a |
| L7 | procedural order that we stick to. So, we're more |
| L8 | than happy to review your testimony. We just can't |
| L9 | take it orally this evening. |
| 20 | MR. HURST: Okay, so you're only going to |
| 21 | take the opposition? |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's where we are |
| 23 | in the procedure, and we're trying not to backtrack |
| 24 | too much. |

MR. HURST: Oh, okay.

25

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But we'd be more than |
|----|--|
| 2 | happy to receive your written testimony. |
| 3 | MR. HURST: Okay. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. The way |
| 5 | we'll proceed is I have a list here of persons who |
| 6 | signed up to testify in opposition, and I'll call you |
| 7 | forward in panels. I understand there are folks from |
| 8 | the Ft. Gaines neighborhood, and I'll begin by calling |
| 9 | them up in two panels of three just to facilitate your |
| 10 | testimony. Jane Khoury, Johnny Cristaldi, Alan |
| 11 | Pollock. |
| 12 | MS. KHOURY: Can we choose the order in |
| 13 | which we testify? |
| 14 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sure, that's fine. |
| 15 | MS. KHOURY: Mr. Pollock will testify |
| 16 | first. |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, and you each |
| 18 | have three minutes. Even though you're in a panel, if |
| 19 | you'd hold your seats, we'll ask the questions to the |
| 20 | panel at the conclusion. |
| 21 | We've been dying to see what's in that |
| 22 | bag. |
| 23 | MR. POLLOCK: Sorry, it's rather |
| 24 | underwhelming. |
| 25 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Now, I guess we're |

| 1 | going to begin with Mr. Pollock, and I just ask you to |
|----|--|
| 2 | direct that microphone, if you're going to stand, just |
| 3 | direct that microphone towards yourself. |
| 4 | MR. POLLOCK: I don't think there will be |
| 5 | a problem with the microphone picking me up. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 7 | MR. POLLOCK: I just need to get my papers |
| 8 | out. I have hand-outs. Do I give them to you? |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Give them to Mr. |
| 10 | Bastida, and he'll give them to us. Ready to roll? |
| 11 | MR. POLLOCK: Wait a minute. Don't start |
| 12 | that clock yet. Three minutes, huh? |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I know you can do it. |
| 14 | MR. POLLOCK: I'll get close. Go. |
| 15 | Alan Pollock, 4428 Sedgwick Street, N.W. |
| 16 | You have two ANC's and five neighborhood associations |
| 17 | in opposition. That would make anyone want to look |
| 18 | very carefully at this application. |
| 19 | You have a population cap, an overstuffed |
| 20 | art center design, and simple act of trying to cross |
| 21 | Massachusetts Avenue. In the '89 campus plan, my |
| 22 | neighbor proposed a 130,000 square foot building next |
| 23 | to my home on the Cassell site. Among our concerns at |
| 24 | that time were building height and light, lost |
| 25 | sunlight, noise, building use. |

My neighbors showed some understanding for its fellow neighbors and lessened the impact of that building by keeping the building pretty much in the Cassell footprint, lowering the main building into the ground so that the tallest part at that time was actually lower than the Cassell gymnasium. My neighbor's law library dropped down at the northwest end as the land fell away.

So, what happened? Well, my neighbor boxed themselves in this time. He took away his options. He took away his flexibility. He stuffed too much into the narrow piece of dirt, and if he had that flexibility, I know he would want to do the right thing, as he did in '89.

Now, the arts center flows from Ward Circle on top of the parking lot garage, and it's on a level plane. As the land falls away from my house, the arts center, by not adhering to the land, rises skyward behind my home. You've heard measurements talked about before over two-thirds the size of FedEx stadium. Four Washington monuments, two on top of each other. Almost two USS Greenville submarines. 4.4 Statue of Liberties that would fill this. It's big and it's long.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's one minute

left.

MR. POLLOCK: Look at page one of the handout I gave you, Exhibit 11. Under the original plan, my home would lose over an hour of sunlight during the wintertime, just as the sunlight is so precious. The lost measure is about 63 minutes of lost sunlight. Real time shadow tests confirm the loss.

Now, if you look at page 4 -- sorry to have to switch -- because of its huge size, I felt that the entire third floor of the northwest end should be relocated. I tried to compromise with the University and suggested that only that portion up to the skylight be relocated. This is 100 feet wide, and this is the only area that we tried to compromise on.

Now, if you go back to page two, the University hasn't said boo about blocking my view. Directly behind my home is a 33-foot wide view of trees on both sides of Mass Avenue, trees in front of Lattner's office, and we can see Hughes and McDowell Hall on the main campus. We've enjoyed this view for 46 years.

To sum up, look, the University is willing to raise the ground to cover the parking garage. Shouldn't they also be willing to dig a bit deeper,

1 lower the ground level to solve its design problems, 2 as well as the main neighborhood impact. 3 believe I've shown you factual, 4 objectionable issues behind my home, masking loss of 5 sunlight, blocking my view. Never been against an 6 arts center, never said not in my back yard. From day 7 one, we said we were willing to work with our neighbor on a reasonable design. 8 9 I'm not being unreasonable in the relief 10 that I'm asking from you. The design is too big for 11 the site. The northwest end is too high. We have no 12 fair agreement to deal with this campus plan. Please tell my neighbor to try a little 13 harder, adjust the third floor, dig a little deeper, 14 15 and lower the northwest end. We feel that is a fair, 16 equitable balance in this application. 17 So, I ask the Commission to remand the plan back to the University for two 18 changes, а 19 realistic enforceable campus plan and create 20 suitable arts center design for the Cassell site or 21 find an appropriate site for the current design. 22 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. 23 Why don't you have a seat while these other folks testify, and then we may have some questions for 24 25 you.

MR. POLLOCK: I'm sure you do.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Shall we go with Mr. Khoury next? You might need to snake that mike.

MS. KHOURY: Yes. I'm not as booming. Thank you.

My name is Jane Khoury, and I live at 4436 Sedgwick Street. My home abuts the side of the Katzen Arts Center, and the northwest end of the building would be erected directly behind my back yard. I support the remarks of Mike Bilecki on behalf of the Fort Gaines Citizens Association and my other Sedgwick Street neighbors concerning the height and mass of the proposed Katzen Arts Center and its adverse impact on my home.

I'd like to focus my testimony on a few diverse points which I believe the Commission should consider prior to rendering a decision on whether the current design of the arts center should be approved. in a meeting between the University, the architect, and the Fort Gaines neighborhood, the architect used the word urban to describe his design That is, no doubt, a very of the Katzen Arts Center. good description of this building design, and I would agree that in a true urban environment, this building the would probably infringe adjacent not on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

residential use.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the neighborhood surrounding However, American University are not really urban. Though part of the District of Columbia, Fort Gaines, Park suburban Valley and ΑU are more akin to neighborhoods where low density, single family homes with private, sunny back yards are taken for granted. As such, the urban design of the Katzen Arts Center dwarfs the adjacent homes, needlessly blocks sunlight, and raises privacy and security concerns.

Second, in another meeting between the University and the neighborhood, it became clear that the immensity of this building is not merely dictated by the needs of the University's art program, but also by the desires of the donor. As the Commission considers whether the benefits of the Katzen Arts Center outweigh the negative impact of this building on the adjoining residences, it should also consider whether the size of this building is really justified by the needs of the University.

Third, I support wholeheartedly the recommendation of the D.C. Office of Planning to require the University to test the soil of the Katzen Arts Center site prior to issuance of a building permit. The University proposed in its campus plan,

"to facilitate a meeting with the Army Corps of Engineers and neighboring residents to discuss the Army's process, surveying the site for potential World War I buried material."

Since the time that condition was proposed, more serious health concerns have come to light, which make it grossly unfair to place the burden on the neighbors for insuring the environmental safety of the site. Accordingly, I would urge the Commission to adopt the OP proposal.

Fourth, I recently have been informed by other neighbors that the land where the Katzen Arts Center will be built was the site of the Civil War fort, Fort Gaines, from which the neighborhood takes its name. As such, it may be an important archeological site which merits careful study before being further disturbed by the demolition of Cassell Center and the construction of the Katzen Arts Center. I don't know much about it, something that perhaps the Commission should consider.

Finally, I consider American University to be a fine neighbor and greatly appreciate their generosity in sharing their facilities with this community. I do not oppose the concept of an arts center on the Cassell Center site. However, the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 Katzen Arts Center as currently designed is 2 inconsistent with the contiguous residential use. Accordingly, I would respectfully request 3 4 the Commission to deny the application of American 5 University for approval of its 2000 campus plan until 6 the building can be redesigned in a manner harmonious with the adjacent residential property use. 7 Thank you. 8 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: 9 Thank Ms. you, 10 Khoury. Mr. Cristaldi? 11 MR. CRISTALDI: Yes. Let me pass these 12 over. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Please do. 13 MR. CRISTALDI: My name is John Cristaldi. 14 15 I'm at 4424 Sedgwick Street. I've come to these 16 I think this is probably my fourth time meetings. 17 here, and I've listened to the lawyers, listened to both sides as everybody has made their 18 19 testimony, and it seems like I'd like to speak some 20 English here, sort of speak to the common folk. 21 One picture does speak a thousand words. For those that can't see it over here, you can look in 22 This is what I'm going to have to face. 23 live directly behind what I call the Exxon oil tanker. 24 25 When you go down 395, you see the Exxon oil tankers,

and that's what I'm going to have to look at. I don't want to look at that.

When I was a kid, I wanted to live by the Lincoln Memorial, but I'm an adult now. I don't want to live by a memorial, not a rotunda. It is too big. It does not blend in the neighborhood. Again, it doesn't matter what you have, as long as it blends it, it's going to look good. This isn't cutting it. It doesn't look good.

has never really listened to ΑU the neighbors or -- well, maybe not listened, but they have ignored the neighbors' demands to lower this Ι building. You know, come from а musician background. I love the arts. Ι love music. Ι wouldn't mind seeing the arts center there, but come on now, this has got to blend in with the area, and it does not.

We already have problems now with parking.

This is going to be even worse now. Today, I couldn't park in front of my house. I have AU students parking there. So, we already have a parking problem. This is going to make it a lot worse.

You know, I mean, I haven't prepared three minutes of talk. A picture speaks a thousand words. Lower the height of the building. If you're a good

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| 1 | engineer and a great architect, you can do that, and I |
|----|--|
| 2 | don't think it's been done. |
| 3 | Thank you. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. |
| 5 | Cristaldi. Any questions for these folks? |
| 6 | I'd like to just pose Mr. Franklin's |
| 7 | question that he asked related to the original use of |
| 8 | the Cassell building and what that use was and its |
| 9 | impact on you, and specifically as it relates to the |
| 10 | service road at the back, if any of you lived there |
| 11 | when that building was in use. |
| 12 | MR. POLLOCK: It brings up what the |
| 13 | neighbor who said you should have known what you were |
| 14 | getting into before you moved into the area. I moved |
| 15 | there in 1955. I've lived behind that gymnasium and |
| 16 | swimming pool. It depends on the time. Are you |
| 17 | referring to what it's been like in the last five |
| 18 | years or ten years? |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, it's been |
| 20 | closed for some time, is that right? |
| 21 | MR. POLLOCK: Well, no, parts of it have |
| 22 | been left open for art students. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, let's deal with |
| 24 | at it's greatest impact to you as a building. What |
| 25 | was the use and what was it like on the service road |

| 1 | behind? |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. POLLOCK: Well, people would come to |
| 3 | park. There are a lot of parking spaces there. Most |
| 4 | of the time, it was reasonable. Occasionally, you'd |
| 5 | have noisy cars. Occasionally you had basketball |
| 6 | games, sporting events in the gymnasium. You had |
| 7 | concerts. We had a steady stream of phone calls to |
| 8 | the university. It would take awhile to get certain |
| 9 | things under control. The swimming pool, certainly |
| 10 | neighbors would bring their children to the swimming |
| 11 | pool. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Which was open to the |
| 13 | outside? |
| 14 | MR. POLLOCK: Yes. It was open on |
| 15 | weekends. It was all daytime activity as far as that |
| 16 | is concerned. |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But let me just make |
| 18 | sure I ask my question right about the swimming pool. |
| 19 | It's an outside swimming pool? |
| 20 | MR. POLLOCK: No. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Or, it's an inside? |
| 22 | MR. POLLOCK: It's an inside. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I think that's |
| 24 | sufficient to answer Mr. Franklin's question. Thank |

you.

| 1 | MR. POLLOCK: Okay. |
|----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anybody else? |
| 3 | SECRETARY BASTIDA: The staff has |
| 4 | requested in order to have that exhibit into the file, |
| 5 | we need to have a picture of it because there is no |
| 6 | way we can |
| 7 | MR. POLLOCK: I'm not taking this home. |
| 8 | SECRETARY BASTIDA: Yes, you are. I need |
| 9 | a picture of it to be able to put into the file. |
| LO | MR. POLLOCK: Do you have a camera? |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Herzstein has a |
| 12 | camera. |
| 13 | SECRETARY BASTIDA: Yes, with several |
| 14 | lenses. |
| 15 | MR. POLLOCK: I'll be submitting my |
| 16 | testimony, and I will take some pictures of this. |
| 17 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And we do hope |
| 18 | they'll be color photos. |
| 19 | SECRETARY BASTIDA: That's right. It's a |
| 20 | beautiful shade of pink. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Did you have some |
| 22 | questions? |
| 23 | MS. DWYER: I just have a couple of |
| 24 | questions. Mr. Pollock, how did you determine the |
| 25 | loss of sunlight? |

1 MR. POLLOCK: We started meeting with the 2 University January 31 of 2000, and one of the things 3 the neighbors asked for was to try and get a better 4 idea of the arts center and what it would look like. 5 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Are you going to be 6 answering the question about sunlight? 7 MR. POLLOCK: Yes. It took them until about January 8 of 2001 to put a scaffold up and, 8 9 thanks to our facilitator, the scaffold would show the 10 the building and the closeness to height of 11 neighborhood. When you're determining loss of 12 sunlight, obviously you have to have some reference 13 points. So, in my home, I used five of the rear 14 15 windows and put a mark which was at the same height as 16 the scaffolding and would check each day as the sun 17 would pass the top of the scaffolding to my left, which was the height of the proposed arts center, and 18 19 would look at the clock and would follow it down until it set behind the existing swimming pool, which is 20 21 directly behind my house, and would mark the time. Now, it was about 63 minutes. 22 To make 23 sure that was accurate, and of course, I would check all five points along the house, as well as check the 24

shadows as they moved across the homes on the opposite

| 1 | side of the street to see whether that time was also |
|----|--|
| 2 | accurate. And to make sure that this was correct, I |
| 3 | did this about, oh, I stopped counting after about 15 |
| 4 | times. |
| 5 | Of course, this was in January, and the |
| 6 | sun set about 3:32 based on the new height of the |
| 7 | building rather than 4:35. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Let's see if Ms. |
| 9 | Dwyer is satisfied with understanding your |
| 10 | methodology. |
| 11 | MS. DWYER: I think I understand the |
| 12 | methodology. So, it was winter, it was January, and |
| 13 | it was loss of an hour. The marks on the windows, |
| 14 | were these the first floor windows or the second floor |
| 15 | windows? |
| 16 | MR. POLLOCK: This is the living space. |
| 17 | We live in Fort Gaines, these are ranch type houses |
| 18 | with the main floor is really the only main floor, and |
| 19 | then we have basements. |
| 20 | MS. DWYER: All right, so it was the main |
| 21 | floor of your house, and it was the winter that you |
| 22 | did this analysis? |
| 23 | MR. POLLOCK: Right. Of course, we didn't |
| 24 | do it in the depth of winter where the sun would set |
| 25 | even earlier in the day in December because the |

| 1 | scaffolds weren't up at that time. It remains even |
|----|--|
| 2 | today to be about the same amount of time, although |
| 3 | the scaffolds were taken down as soon as the hearing |
| 4 | started. So, we don't have as accurate a measuring |
| 5 | point, but the marks are still there. |
| 6 | MS. DWYER: But the sun moves during the |
| 7 | course of the year. |
| 8 | MR. POLLOCK: Sure it does. |
| 9 | MS. DWYER: So what happens in January |
| 10 | might not be the same it might not be the same loss |
| 11 | of time today as it was in January. |
| 12 | MR. POLLOCK: No, it's about the same |
| 13 | time. Even as the sun has moved up, it's I've |
| 14 | tried to make sure that it was generally in that area. |
| 15 | Of course, the sun is, I think, most needed in the |
| 16 | heart of wintertime when you have so little light. |
| 17 | MS. DWYER: And this loss of light was |
| 18 | from 3:30 to 4:30 in the afternoon? |
| 19 | MR. POLLOCK: When we started measuring |
| 20 | it, when I started measuring it, it set behind the top |
| 21 | of the scaffold at 3:32 in the afternoon, and it set |
| 22 | behind the existing swimming pool where it currently |
| 23 | would set at 4:35. That was the those were, I |
| 24 | think, some of the original times. |

MS. DWYER:

25

Okay. One other question.

You have suggested that in addition to perhaps reducing the height of the building at the rear, that perhaps the University should look at lowering the building. Were you aware from discussions with the University and the architect in the beginning that one of their goals was to maintain the grade along Massachusetts Avenue and not dig in and take out all of the natural grade of Massachusetts Avenue?

MR. POLLOCK: Excuse me. The University said that the biggest problem was there was solid rock, and they didn't want to go to the expense of digging through the rock. We did show them how they could -- you know, it's a question here of this down here. This is new.

The parking garage, it's very important to the university. They have 550 spaces. We showed them how they could take out, I think it was less than 80, Mike? About 40? Take out about 40 spaces and lower a lot of the activity in their that wouldn't need the type of light, although our architect has shown me some really interesting ideas about how to bring light. What did you say, it went down -- it's gone down as far as 100 feet in some universities, have brought light down that far.

MS. DWYER: So, your proposal is to -- do

| 1 | you have an idea of what the depth is that you're |
|----|--|
| 2 | proposing that the building be lowered into the |
| 3 | ground, sunk into the ground? |
| 4 | MR. POLLOCK: Well, we talked about from |
| 5 | the rotunda northwest. We asked over and over again |
| 6 | about lowering or relocating that third floor. So, |
| 7 | the compromise position was to take just that part of |
| 8 | the third floor that was toward the neighborhood on |
| 9 | the other side of the skylight. |
| 10 | MS. DWYER: And that's what's shown in |
| 11 | your drawing? That's the red area shown in your |
| 12 | drawing, your compromise? This yellow area? |
| 13 | MR. POLLOCK: Well, that's behind my |
| 14 | particular home, that's what I would see as a minimum |
| 15 | compromise position. |
| 16 | MS. DWYER: Okay. All right, thank you. |
| 17 | MR. POLLOCK: You're welcome. |
| 18 | MS. DWYER: Jane, I have just a couple of |
| 19 | questions for you. Are you aware that the height of |
| 20 | this building is lower than what would be permitted as |
| 21 | a matter of right? |
| 22 | MS. KHOURY: I don't really care. |
| 23 | MS. DWYER: Okay. Do you know what the |
| 24 | height of this building is? |
| 25 | MS. KHOURY: Not off the top of my head. |

| 1 | MS. DWYER: Okay, and are you aware that |
|----|--|
| 2 | the setbacks in this building are more than what would |
| 3 | be required as a matter of right? |
| 4 | MS. KHOURY: Again, I don't care. |
| 5 | MS. DWYER: All right, and Mr. Cristaldi, |
| 6 | I have just one question. I thought you had indicated |
| 7 | in your testimony that the University had not made |
| 8 | changes to the building as a result of the process? |
| 9 | MR. CRISTALDI: The type of changes that |
| 10 | were made has really no effect on the visual impact |
| 11 | I'm going to have to witness for the rest of my life |
| 12 | that I'm living there. |
| 13 | MS. DWYER: All right. So, your testimony |
| 14 | was not that changes were made but that the changes |
| 15 | that were made do not address your concerns? |
| 16 | MR. CRISTALDI: Nor do they address the |
| 17 | other neighbors' concerns that much. Very little. |
| 18 | Two percent change is not enough. |
| 19 | MS. DWYER: Okay, thank you. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Ms. Dwyer. |
| 21 | Ms. Hamilton, did you have any questions for these |
| 22 | folks? Okay, Ms. Quynn? |
| 23 | MS. QUYNN: Okay, for Mr. Pollock. Mr. |
| 24 | Pollock, you said that you've been a resident of Fort |
| 25 | Gaines since 1955, is that right? |

MR. POLLOCK: Yes.

MS. QUYNN: You're dating yourself when you say that. Can you briefly describe how that neighborhood has -- what it was like in 1955 and maybe what the University's presence was at that time?

MR. POLLOCK: You're going to go back to that neighbor who loved living next to the University.

I think the University fixed his curb or something. I like to fix anyway.

What I knew about the neighbor is was moving next to when I moved into Fort Gaines, which is about -- I think the neighborhood is about 50 years old -- according to the dean of students at that time, he told me that the University had less than 1200 full-time students.

I know the University had a lot more trees. I'm a graduate of the American University. I certainly enjoyed the amazing change of walking across Massachusetts Avenue and going behind those trees, and I was in a different world, and it was lovely.

At some point, I guess you always, and you heard it in this hearing. The neighbor is always saying, the University is always saying we were here first, we were here first. That's true, but after about 50 years, isn't there a limit on expansion

| 1 | impact to the residents that abut the University? I |
|----|--|
| 2 | mean, I haven't built anything that they've complained |
| 3 | about. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I think Ms. |
| 5 | Quynn's question was not about holding forth on who |
| 6 | was there first and so on but just the nature of the |
| 7 | University. So, I take it there was less intense |
| 8 | development. There were more trees. It was a smaller |
| 9 | student body. |
| 10 | MR. POLLOCK: Right, and certainly a |
| 11 | smaller student body and less traffic. I mean, things |
| 12 | have grown all over the place, but I mean, did you |
| 13 | want to get an idea of what sort of a neighbor they |
| 14 | were? |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, Ms. Quynn, what |
| 16 | are you looking for? |
| 17 | MS. QUYNN: Well, that was my next |
| 18 | question, sure. What kind of neighbor has AU been in |
| 19 | the 46 years since you've been there. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And we want these to |
| 21 | be, you know, brief. |
| 22 | MR. POLLOCK: Brief, oh. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Your neighbors would |
| 24 | like to testify tonight while we're still, you know, |
| 25 | sort of perky. |

MR. POLLOCK: To get the University to do something to correct a problem takes a lot of arm twisting, and sometimes they do and sometimes they don't but I'll give you the examples that to me say that they haven't been the best of neighbors.

Imagine yourself waking up one morning to chain saws and looking out your window, and the University is cutting down your fence. You go running out there and say, you're cutting down my fence. They said no, it's our fence. You say excuse me, I put this fence up. As a matter of fact, your mother had just put up a brand new fence. They cut it down.

Imagine the University cleaning up its property and has the leaf blowers, and they come down and blow all these leaves and debris into your yard. By the way, they never apologized for cutting down our fence.

You have the buses, you know, the Coach buses that bring teams from other places or visitors.

Until they found the Westover people more accommodating, they would put the buses there, and they would run all day for air conditioning or run all day to keep the heat up or late into the evening, you have to call and call, can you please at least have them stop the engine. We didn't mind the buses there,

| 1 | but it's the noise. |
|----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is that getting the |
| 3 | gist of your |
| 4 | MS. QUYNN: That's fine. |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think we got that. |
| 6 | I think we got that. |
| 7 | MR. POLLOCK: How about the front loader |
| 8 | and the backhoe? |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, no, we got |
| LO | it. |
| L1 | MR. POLLOCK: Eight o'clock in the |
| L2 | morning. |
| L3 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, Ms. Quynn? |
| L4 | MS. QUYNN: I'm finished. Thank you. |
| L5 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, thanks. Okay, |
| L6 | and Mr. Wilson, did you have any cross examination? |
| L7 | MR. WILSON: No, I don't. |
| L8 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, thank you. We |
| L9 | look forward to the pictures of your exhibit. Thank |
| 20 | you, folks. |
| 21 | Okay, will the next panel from Fort |
| 22 | Gaines. I think it's Andrew Harris. I can't read the |
| 23 | last name very well. Florence Seliba and Manuel |
| 24 | Fernandez. |
| 25 | MR. BILECKY: Florence had to leave. She |

| 1 | gave me power of attorney to read her statement. |
|----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's fine. |
| 3 | MR. BILECKY: I'll just read it. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is it written? Do |
| 5 | you have copies for us? |
| 6 | MR. BILECKY: Let me check. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. If you have |
| 8 | copies, it would be just as easy for us if you would |
| 9 | submit it for the record. |
| LO | Okay, Mr. Harris? Is it Harris? |
| L1 | MR. HARRIS: Yes. |
| L2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. You need to |
| L3 | push the button in the center, and then the little red |
| L4 | light will go on. Anybody, help Mr. Harris. |
| L5 | MR. HARRIS: My name is Andrew Harris, and |
| L6 | I live at 4420 Sedgwick Street, N.W. Our neighborhood |
| L7 | borders American University along Sedgwick and 44th |
| L8 | Streets. We are aware of the potential benefit from |
| L9 | having the Katzen Arts Center located on the Cassell |
| 20 | site, but we vehemently oppose the further processing |
| 21 | of it as presently designed. |
| 22 | Not much has been done by AU to allay this |
| 23 | skepticism. We now have an open air, unobstructed |
| 24 | sight light from our home. The proposed art gallery |
| 25 | and performing arts sections will eliminate this open |

view.

We weighed the benefit of having the Katzen project and accepted it provisionally. Therefore, we expected compromise from AU relative to the section of the center to be located behind our home. There has been continuous objection to this section since May, 2000.

The graduate studio section to be located on the third floor, east of the rotunda, will be approximately 20 feet closer to our home than the existing structure on the site. We have objected strenuously to the full windows shown for this section of the building. Their relationship to our home cannot be shielded, and there is almost an eyeball to eyeball sight line from our family room windows to these windows. During --

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You accidentally turned off your microphone there.

MR. HARRIS: During negotiation with AU, AU's architect stated that the windows could be deleted and supplanted with skylights providing a natural lighting effect AU wanted for the graduate studios. AU apparently has not endorsed this design compromise and has rigidly held to installing the objectionable windows.

Therefore, we urge the Zoning Commission to consider enforcing our objections to the stated windows. Moreover, we request that AU redesign this section of the third floor to either remove it completely or reduce its size, lengthening the distance between it and our home.

In my humble conclusion, please be mindful of these potential problems. One, the art center's window and lights facing our home. Secondly, the closeness of the arts center building to our property line. Three, impact of the large arts center parking garage on Ward Circle, Mass Avenue, 45th and 46th. Lastly, students and workmen parking on Sedgwick Street and 44th.

May I go on further to say that --

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You need to summarize now because you're out of time, so another maybe one more thought.

MR. HARRIS: Well, a summary would be quick -- not a summary, but just a statement that we have been in negotiations with American University since, serious negotiations since May of 2000. It seems as if the University has not really come across with anything. Dr. Ralph Bunch had serious things to do over in the Middle East during the crises over

1 there, and they were able at least to get the warring 2 factions to stop firing at each other. 3 It seems as though American U has taken 4 the position, hopefully, I hope this is not true, that 5 we came, we saw, and we conquered. That's the end of 6 my statement. 7 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right, thank you, Mr. Harris. Mr. Bilecky, do you want to read the 8 9 statement quickly? 10 MR. BILECKY: I'm reading a statement on behalf of Florence Seliba. 11 12 home is one of several directly Mvaffected by the design of the service drive to the 13 rear of the proposed arts center. Our concerns about 14 15 noise emanating from the section of the drive behind 16 our homes have not been satisfactorily addressed. 17 The drive is lowered below grade but open 18 at the top. It is proposed to be constructed 19 essentially as a concrete trough. AU has expressed 20 that this design will help shield our homes from the 21 noise of truck traffic. Our perception is that the trough will 22 concrete act more as а resonating amplifier than as a silencer. 23 24 We've recognized that we are not sound 25 engineering experts be voicing and may an

| 1 | unsubstantiated concern. However, AU has chosen to |
|----|--|
| 2 | ignore our concerns and proposed a design equally |
| 3 | unsubstantiated by analysis of the appropriate |
| 4 | professional discipline. |
| 5 | The lack of attention given to our |
| 6 | concerns about the service drive is but one small |
| 7 | example of many neighborhood issues that have been |
| 8 | ignored by AU. I request that the Zoning Commission |
| 9 | withhold further processing of the arts center and |
| 10 | direct AU to reach an enforceable agreement with the |
| 11 | neighbors for all design aspects of the proposed arts |
| 12 | center before they can resubmit for further |
| 13 | processing. |
| 14 | Signed, Florence Seliba. |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Mr. |
| 16 | Fernandez? |
| 17 | MR. FERNANDEZ: I have some pictures. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You need to turn on |
| 19 | your mike if you're going to speak. |
| 20 | MR. FERNANDEZ: I have some pictures for |
| 21 | you to review. |
| 22 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, great. |
| 23 | MR. FERNANDEZ: The view from, as one of |
| 24 | the neighbors explained, these houses are all ranches. |
| 25 | So, the view from the living floor, the main floor, |

| 1 | out to the back yard. |
|----|---|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 3 | MR. FERNANDEZ: You need to stop that |
| 4 | clock. |
| 5 | MR. FERNANDEZ: These are identical. |
| 6 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, give them to |
| 7 | staff, and he'll pass them down. You need to stop the |
| 8 | clock. I think you just want to restart it. |
| 9 | MR. FERNANDEZ: Start? |
| LO | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Please. |
| L1 | MR. FERNANDEZ: Okay. My name is Manuel |
| L2 | Fernandez. I live at 4432 Sedgwick. I've passed out |
| L3 | pictures, again, of the view from the house and the |
| L4 | main living level, out to the back yard, looking at |
| L5 | the Cassell Center, specifically the old pool, what |
| L6 | had been the pool building. |
| L7 | My wife and I have lived at 4432 for seven |
| L8 | years. We bought the house seven years ago with the |
| L9 | understanding that AU was a back yard neighbor, and |
| 20 | they might wish to replace the Cassell Center, which |
| 21 | was even aging at that time. |
| 22 | Prior to our purchase, we consulted |
| 23 | neighbors, as well as AU's planning office to get a |
| 24 | sense of the scale and type of building that we might |
| 25 | reasonably expect AU would be allowed to build on the |

site. We felt comfortable given the approval of the law school plan for that site at the time about what the scale that we might expect AU could build to replace the Cassell Center.

I believe that the proposed Katzen Arts

Center has a much larger adverse impact on the

neighboring properties than that of the planned law

school, and clearly the impact far exceeds that of the

existing buildings on the site.

I don't see how the residential zoning of the site can accommodate the Katzen Center as it is proposed. However, I think it's possible to find a solution which accommodates both the University's need to use the site, put it to productive use, and the neighbors' desire to live next to a less imposing building than that which is proposed.

I don't agree that the current design is the only way to accommodate the programmatic requirements of the arts programs of the University. As many of my neighbors have expressed, I'm opposed to the current design and urge the Commission not to approve it.

I'd like to use my remaining time to urge the Commission to review the current campus plan approval process with the goal of crafting effective

enforcement mechanisms. At present, it appears the enforcement mechanism is limited to withholding processing approval of further for any buildings constructed during the term of the ten-year In the absence of additional construction, plan. there is no effective enforcement mechanism.

The University has testified that it did not abide by the terms of the last agreement with the residents. Without an enforcement mechanism, there is no onus on the University or no pressure for it to do so. If there's no onus, clearly compliance with any agreement with the neighbors will have very low priority.

If we're going to have good relations with the University going forward into the future, regardless of the decision of the Zoning Commission with regard to this building, the proposed Katzen Arts Center, there has to be some enforcement mechanism. Otherwise, how can we insure that anything that we agreed to, and the neighbors have spent a great deal of time, as well as the University representatives negotiating that that will be complied with.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You're out of time.

MR. FERNANDEZ: I know. It was timed. It wasn't coincidental.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It was excellent. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. FERNANDEZ: I know. You're looking at |
| 3 | me like he couldn't have finished. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well |
| 5 | MR. FERNANDEZ: He couldn't have finished. |
| 6 | I could go on. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, you injected some |
| 8 | discipline to the process, so we appreciate that. Any |
| 9 | questions from the commissioners? Ms. Dwyer? |
| -0 | MS. DWYER: I just have one question for |
| .1 | Mr. Fernandez, just as a point of clarification. I |
| .2 | think you said that the University said that it did |
| _3 | not comply with the conditions of the 1989 plan, and I |
| _4 | just wanted to know if you had looked at the record. |
| .5 | We had filed a document indicating how every condition |
| -6 | had been complied with. |
| L7 | MR. FERNANDEZ: That wasn't the in |
| L8 | testimony before the Commission, I'm not privy to |
| L9 | those or haven't seen them. |
| 20 | MS. DWYER: Okay. I just wanted to |
| 21 | clarify that then. Thank you. |
| 22 | MR. FERNANDEZ: So, was that a |
| 23 | misstatement during the testimony, or was I I |
| 24 | didn't hear it correctly? |
| 25 | MS. DWYER: I thought your testimony was |

| Τ | that we had not complied. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. FERNANDEZ: You did before the |
| 3 | Commission here. You may have corrected that |
| 4 | subsequently, but I was in the hearing, unless I heard |
| 5 | that wrong. You admitted that you had not complied |
| 6 | with all the terms. I believe that was an exchange |
| 7 | with Mr. Herzstein or some other resident. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I know that |
| 9 | there was some discussion regarding the attempt to |
| 10 | control the lights. |
| 11 | MS. DWYER: There were lights on one |
| 12 | building, but we filed in the record a document |
| 13 | indicating all of the conditions and our compliance |
| 14 | with that. So, that's in the file. |
| 15 | MR. FERNANDEZ: So notwithstanding what |
| 16 | you said here when we were all present, later you |
| 17 | filed something that said that you were in compliance, |
| 18 | notwithstanding the testimony that was given here? |
| 19 | Because I don't have that other document and didn't |
| 20 | review it. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I think Ms. |
| 22 | Dwyer is just trying to clarify. |
| 23 | MS. DWYER: That's all. |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What you heard as far |
| 25 | as testimony from the Applicant because I believe you |

| 1 | said that the Applicant testified that they did not |
|----|---|
| 2 | comply. She's just trying to and some folks from |
| 3 | the community have asserted that they did not comply, |
| 4 | but she's trying to clarify what the University |
| 5 | testified to. |
| 6 | MR. FERNANDEZ: I'm not an attorney, but I |
| 7 | was here, and that's what I heard. So, somewhere |
| 8 | there's a confusion because I did hear that. I was |
| 9 | here and I was listening. |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 11 | MR. FERNANDEZ: I did admit, I forget |
| 12 | which one of the Commissioners pointed that out. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Well, are you |
| 14 | satisfied, Ms. Dwyer? |
| 15 | MS. DWYER: Yes. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, thank you. |
| 17 | Let's see, before you get up. Ms. Hamilton, did you |
| 18 | have any cross examination? Please come forward. |
| 19 | MS. HAMILTON: In fact, my question is for |
| 20 | Mr. Fernandez. You have lived in the property about |
| 21 | seven years, you said. When you purchased the |
| 22 | property, you backed to the Cassell Center and you |
| 23 | factored in that building and what you understood was |
| 24 | proposed for that site when you purchased, in your |
| 25 | purchase offer. What effect do you think this |

| _ | proposed arts center will have upon the value of |
|----|--|
| 2 | properties on Sedgwick Street? |
| 3 | MR. FRANKLIN: It's very hard for me to |
| 4 | say because I'm here not solely contemplating or |
| 5 | projecting forward what the value of the property |
| 6 | would be or if there would be a reduction. My family, |
| 7 | we do not intend to move, so my interest here is for |
| 8 | the quality of life and the quality of living there. |
| 9 | It's not really an economic consideration, |
| 10 | so I'm here testifying to that effect. I can't |
| 11 | imagine that the scale of the Katzen Center, again, |
| 12 | would be attractive to many potential home purchasers. |
| 13 | I think it is out of proportion, as some of my |
| 14 | neighbors have testified, with the residential nature |
| 15 | of Fort Gaines. It's just incongruent. |
| 16 | Again, I'm not here to salvage economic |
| 17 | value, and I haven't done those projections. It's |
| 18 | about the quality of life that we've enjoyed over |
| 19 | seven years in Fort Gaines. |
| 20 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Ms. |
| 21 | Hamilton. Ms. Quynn, did you have anything? |
| 22 | MS. QUYNN: No questions. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Wilson? Mr. |
| 24 | Elliott? Mr. Herzstein, any cross? Thank you, |
| 25 | gentlemen. |

| 1 | The next panel we'll have is Wesley Egan, |
|----|---|
| 2 | Don Myer, Thomas Vonier, and please excuse me if I |
| 3 | mispronounced your name. |
| 4 | MR. EGAN: Mr. Vonier had to leave. |
| 5 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Then |
| 6 | let's have Mary Bresnahan. Is Mary Bresnahan here? |
| 7 | MS. BRESNAHAN: Yes, I am. |
| 8 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, okay. Just come |
| 9 | forward, and we'll start with Mr. Egan. |
| 10 | MR. EGAN: Thank you, Madame Chair. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You need to turn on |
| 12 | your mike. |
| 13 | MR. EGAN: Okay, thank you, Madame Chair. |
| 14 | My name is Wes Egan, and my wife and I live within |
| 15 | 200 feet of the AU Tenley campus at 4204 Yuma Street, |
| 16 | a home that we have owned since 1985. Since then, we |
| 17 | have watched new families many of them with children, |
| 18 | move into these older homes to enjoy and in the |
| 19 | process revitalize this urban residential |
| 20 | neighborhood. |
| 21 | Many, including myself, have invested in |
| 22 | renovating and upgrading these single family homes, |
| 23 | thereby improving and sustaining the special |
| 24 | residential character of this part of the Washington |
| 25 | community and the tax base. We have chosen to live in |

the District. We support our local public elementary school.

We have worked closely with D.C. Park and Recreation authorities to improve the parks in our area, and we welcome the distinctive contribution the public and private educational institutions, including American University, as well as government, diplomatic, and religious institutions make to our city and to our neighborhood.

It was in this spirit that the ANC 3-E and specifically, those of us who live within 200 feet of what is now the AU Tenley campus, agreed to support the University's special use request for that campus in 1985, 1986, under conditions which were subsequently recognized in the BZA approval of that request.

The concerns that prompted our discussions and negotiated agreement with AU at that time to insure that this property would be used, and I quote, in such a manner that its current the long term impact, and I would like to emphasize the expression long term impact, on the vicinity of the property, is minimized.

Those concerns are even greater today.

The University's actual and apparently intended use of

this property for controlled private and commercial vehicle access to the property, continued commercial development along Wisconsin Avenue, scheduled bus and unauthorized traffic on Yuma Street and through vehicle and truck traffic on 42nd Street have only increased the pressures and threats against this neighborhood.

To construct a three-story, 100,000 square foot building of undetermined use and to more than triple the existing parking on this site, despite the past and current objections of the taxpaying residents in this area and the existence of an agreement negotiated responsibly and in good faith, without which, I might add, the University would never have been granted use of this site, could easily destroy our residential neighborhood as a neighborhood.

The old Immaculata School campus now owned by AU was built, scaled, and used in proportion to the size and character of this neighborhood and this part of the city. Those buildings and those who used them did intrude physically not or visually into residential structures or space. Like many other institutions in AU Park, they existed in balance with the single family residential environment.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You need to sum up

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

now, Mr. Egan.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. EGAN: Project M on that site would destroy that balance. It is not in keeping with the mixed use residential neighborhood of ΑU Park. Needless to say, we are aware of the impact of the development of other universities on neighborhoods in the District, and as one of your constituents, I would ask the Zoning Commission disapprove the that University's proposal to build on and to substantially alter and expand the use of the Tenleytown campus.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Egan.
Mr. Myer?

MR. MYER: Good evening. I would like to associate with Ambassador Egan's comments and simply add that probably the Tenley campus ought to be off the table just like the law school is because the issues are considerably different. The planning issues with regard to the Tenley campus are unique to that particular site because of the tree canopy, because of the historic structures, and the unique separation of the campuses geographically.

We have something like four curb cuts on Yuma Street, which I live on. Several loading docks, a couple of parking lots, directly across the street

| 1 | from two schools, one for primary, one for middle age, |
|----|--|
| 2 | one middle school children, and a church. The chaos |
| 3 | of 18-wheelers delivering food for the cafeterias, the |
| 4 | trucks parked across the sidewalk, the dangerous |
| 5 | conditions, generally are unresolved. |
| 6 | I would just simply plea that anything |
| 7 | that happens on the Tenley campus be dealt with on the |
| 8 | basis of excellence in design and planning. I don't |
| 9 | see that happening. I see a very, very vague kind of |
| 10 | operation there that does not include the entire curb |
| 11 | to curb to curb to curb peripheral aspect of good |
| 12 | planning that will enhance the environment of both the |
| 13 | school and the neighborhood. |
| 14 | Thank you. |
| 15 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Myer. |
| 16 | Ms. Bresnahan. |
| 17 | MS. BRESNAHAN: Good evening. |
| 18 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You need to turn on |
| 19 | the microphone. |
| 20 | MS. BRESNAHAN: Sorry. Good evening. I |
| 21 | am Mary Bresnahan, and I am a native Washingtonian, |
| 22 | and I am also president of the Spring Valley Court |
| 23 | Association. I am expressing my opposition to the |
| 24 | American University 2000 campus plan and further |
| 25 | processing applications, and I am requesting that the |

Zoning Commission take no action on the proposed ten year American University plan and further processing applications until the current Department of Defense formerly utilized defense site, DOD FUDS, removal action and remedial investigation is concluded.

I'm also requesting that the Commission defer further consideration of the proposed campus plan pending public notice and comment opportunities on the selection of any additional removal actions. campus plan presents substantial issues The previously considered by the Zoning Commission. The Army Corps of Engineers has expanded their list of interest, POI's, points of and areas needing additional evaluation further into the surrounding neighborhoods.

The Zoning Commission should not be taking under consideration or approving small or large scale construction plans for University when the the Department of Health has urged caution the neighborhood until final tests are completed. The Department of Health has issued protective guidelines which encompass mowing, gardening, and other yard consuming vegetables grown in your spending time in your yard, and construction reason being that moving soil or coming into contact

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

with soil should be minimized since airborne arsenic can become a health risk. Attachments A, B, and C go into great detail.

The federal requirements for removal actions which the Department of Defense has determined will apply to FUDS removal activities require engineering analysis, evaluation cost EECA, be conducted for the site by the Corps, 40 C.F.R. This **EECA** analyze removal alternatives must remediation and the respective environmental effects and risk reduction benefits of each of those.

Some of these typically include institutional controls, i.e., zoning requirements that limit particular uses of the property. decisions should be made in the interim which preclude selection of appropriate the remedy which community is entitled to an opportunity to comment prior to any final decision.

AU should not be put in the position in which it can rely upon any provision of an approved campus plan to prevent or preclude selection of an appropriate removal action. I am requesting that the Commission cease action on the campus plan until the overreaching environmental remedy has been resolved.

The quality of the environment in each

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| community has an impact on the health of the |
|--|
| residents, the health of the city, and the health of |
| property values. I hope for these reasons that AU |
| will join us in agreeing that deferral of Zoning |
| Commission action at this time on the proposed campus |
| plan is appropriate. |
| CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Ms. |
| Bresnahan. Any questions for this panel? Ms. Dwyer? |
| Ms. Hamilton? |
| MS. HAMILTON: My question is for Ms. |
| Bresnahan. Do you have any sense of the time frame on |
| this munitions evaluation removal project or plan? |
| MS. BRESNAHAN: Yes. The Army Corps of |
| Engineers has issued a time frame that is somewhat |
| moveable in that they're forming a RAB, and that RAB |
| will consist of neighborhood representatives to begin |
| that process, and it probably is going to take the |
| testing will not be completed for eight months of all |
| 1200 properties. |
| MS. HAMILTON: Eight months from when? |
| MS. BRESNAHAN: I believe May, but I'm not |
| positive. I mean, it has been an ongoing process to |
| complete it, but I believe it begins in May. It |
| should be completed, they're hoping, in the late fall, |
| |

but that the actual remedial action and the removal

1 probably will be a two-year process. 2 MS. HAMILTON: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: 3 Thank you. Ms. 4 Quynn, any questions? Mr. Wilson? Mr. Elliott? Mr. 5 Thank you all. Herzstein? If we could have now Guy Gwynne, Michael 6 7 Pollock, Dennis Paul. Mr. Gwynne, please proceed. MR. GWYNNE: I'm Guy Gwynne, president of 8 9 the D.C. Federation of Citizens Associations. In my brief comment here today, I want to urge the Zoning 10 Commission in the American University case to continue 11 12 the excellent work BZA has done in getting a grip on the city for the city on the hitherto virtually 13 sprawl systemic problem. 14 unregulated campus We 15 necessarily take a slightly broader view. I'm 16 addressing the American University case. Some of the basic problems facing 17 Spring Valley, AU Park, Fort Gaines Associations area, 18 19 all of whom are in the Federation, are the same as those facing residential communities surrounding the 20 21 Georgetown and George Washington Universities also, as well, we could extrapolate, from that also, Catholic 22 23 and Gallaudet Universities. Concerning the off-campus student renter 24 25 numbers, University generated parking problems, noise,

| 1 | and impedance of normal community turnover, these |
|----|--|
| 2 | problems are impacting enough in the American |
| 3 | University area and are apparently progressing toward |
| 4 | the level of these problems in the Foggy Bottom and |
| 5 | Georgetown areas, Parenthetically, I'm from the |
| 6 | Berleath area, which is a heavily impacted, virtually |
| 7 | destabilized neighborhood because of University impact |
| 8 | over the past 18 years, approximately. |
| 9 | No other problem besets residential |
| 10 | communities in university areas as that of export by |
| 11 | universities of unhoused students and the problems |
| 12 | that go with the constant fluctuating flooding of |
| 13 | thousands of transient young renters in the |
| 14 | communities. |
| 15 | Next in seriousness is the heretofore |
| 16 | ineffectively regulated problem of university campus |
| 17 | sprawl and laissez faire buying up of off campus |
| 18 | properties. We see that beginning |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You have one minute |
| 20 | left |
| 21 | MR. GWYNNE: I'm speaking for the |
| 22 | Federation. I should have five minutes. |
| 23 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: The way we've broken |
| 24 | it down for this is we have three minutes for all |
| 25 | persons and then unfortunately you're anything you |

| 1 | nave that's written we'd be happy to take. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. GWYNNE: I will be submitting written |
| 3 | testimony later. |
| 4 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. |
| 5 | Basically, let me just summarize then. As I see it, |
| 6 | the American University areas, these excellent basic |
| 7 | communities of our tax base in this city, are at a |
| 8 | stage now with University impact, approximately where |
| 9 | the Georgetown, George Washington areas were between |
| 10 | ten and 15 years ago. |
| 11 | If the Commission doesn't get a grip on |
| 12 | this potential university campus sprawl and constantly |
| 13 | rising numbers of students with no housing or very |
| 14 | little, inadequate housing on campus, they're going to |
| 15 | be virtually destabilized neighborhoods, much like the |
| 16 | Berleath case and much like the part of Georgetown |
| 17 | down Prospect Avenue. |
| 18 | So, this is the time to act. |
| 19 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. |
| 20 | Gwynne. Mr. Pollock? |
| 21 | MR. POLLOCK: Thank you, Madame Chair. |
| 22 | Tonight and on previous occasions, you have heard, at |
| 23 | quite lengthy times, testimony from parties on both |
| 24 | sides of the campus plan. I feel I hold a unique view |
| 25 | on this issue As a member of the Fort Gaines |

neighborhood, I share the concerns of the residents involved here tonight because they are my neighbors.

As a member of the AU student body, I recognize the great benefits this institution provides to its students, to higher education as a whole, and to its neighbors. Through all of the previous meetings, however, one primary party to these proceedings has been underrepresented, and that is the AU student body.

This reflects not only on the gulf between students and neighborhood residents, but also shows the lack of information sharing between the students have received from the University. I ask that the Board reject the campus plan as it stands on the grounds that the University has not provided enough detailed description of their plan to either the neighbors or the students.

The inconsistencies in this plan deeply troubling. This echoes the opinion of an overwhelming majority of students, including commissioner, many of student ANC the student government and student-run organizations. We understand the need for a new arts center. note parking is a premium on campus. We pay for it.

We are also keenly aware of the need for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

additional on campus housing. However, do we need an increased student cap, especially when our residence halls are so full that for the fall of 2000 semester, students were living in lounges on cots. We are, in the view of the Residential Life and Housing Association, running at 105 percent capacity already.

Let me wrap up by saying that we, students. feel AU is a positive institution and a positive force in the neighborhood, and it's trying to alienate its students or its neighbors. We know the University is making an effort, the issues at stake here are too important for the University to fudge.

Let me reiterate. One, the student cap Is it necessary, and do we have the room for it, and is there any information on square footage per student and how that would be affected by the increase of a student cap. Two, the lack of info to students, of whom don't know about these many proceedings at all. Three, the inconsistencies on what buildings, what size, what usage, and what types of funding they might get, or will they be built at all.

Four, if one part of this plan is not approved, then other parts of it will fail as well,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

specifically, parking. If the Bender Arena lot is closed and approved, which doesn't seem to be a big problem, they are going to need 466 more spaces on campus. Where are they going to put it and how will they get it out there before they park in the neighborhoods.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Can you summarize?

MR. POLLOCK: Thank you. I'm all done.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Very good, thank you.

Mr. Paul?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. PAUL: My name is Dennis Paul. МУ home is on University Avenue, which borders American University on the west. The homes on University have a view of the tennis courts, the athletic field, the track, the current bleachers. Beyond and clearly visible are Leonard Dorm, the sports center, the sports center garage, the two heating Asbury buildings, smokestacks, the the Osborne buildings, the Beagley building, and the Letts Anderson Centennial Dorms.

During the 1989 campus plan negotiations, we were assured that in three to five years, the proposed landscape buffer would screen the campus buildings from our homes, and I have attached some pictures on tab four in your binder. In project C,

the University is proposing to replace the Osborne building with another which would include on its roof bleachers for spectators.

These bleachers would face west, meaning the noise from spectators and sound system would be directed toward our homes. Currently when events, athletic or otherwise, take place in that area, a simplistic sound system is set up at ground level facing west. The transmission is heard loud and inside our homes. Placing bleachers facing west and most likely including a sophisticated sound system would be an intrusion and is not acceptable to the adjacent neighbors.

The noise level from persons cheering, booing, seated in the current bleachers facing east is tolerable because their voices are directed away from our homes. The University has stated that normally two to 300 persons attend the athletic events, and at a hotly contested game, five to 800. Therefore, the current bleachers are quite adequate.

We are concerned that increasing the bleacher seating will change the nature and number of events held in this area and create an inappropriate impact on the adjacent homes. There is a great deal of green space surrounding the athletic field and

track where spectators may sit, if needed.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Reducing the proposed bleachers to 500 seats is not an acceptable response. The noise would still be highly objectionable. The bleachers must be deleted from the plan. We understand the University's desire to enhance its facilities.

However, we do not believe the quality of life for families and neighbors should be our compromised to satisfy those desires or goals. University's efforts to improve the convenience of seating at sports events cannot justify the diminution the neighbors' quality of life and decrease property values.

In project F, the University proposes to replace the Asbury building. Clearly visible from the yards and homes on University Avenue, the proposed replacement will be twice the size of the current buildings. Taller than the sports center, after darkness will create additional lighted windows visible to the neighbors' homes. We are concerned with noise from equipment.

Currently during warm months, air conditioning equipment from buildings can be heard from our open windows. We propose maintaining the height of the present building and enclosing the

| 1 | courtyard area to create additional space. Even |
|----|--|
| 2 | though the sports center garage would be partially |
| 3 | hidden from the homes, if building F is built as |
| 4 | proposed, creating more mass and density is not a |
| 5 | desirable effect. It would be preferable to have a |
| 6 | lower structure creating a step-down appearance. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Paul, are you |
| 8 | going to summarize? |
| 9 | MR. PAUL: That's it. |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. |
| 11 | MR. PAUL: You got it. |
| 12 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Very good, thank you. |
| 13 | Any questions for these folks? Ms Dwyer? Ms. |
| 14 | Hamilton? Ms. Quynn? Wilson? Elliott? |
| 15 | MR. ELLIOTT: Just one question, Mr. Paul. |
| 16 | Your testimony is under tab four here, and I wonder |
| 17 | if you could just explain to the Commission this one |
| 18 | picture. Stand up, if you would. You have a little |
| 19 | caption on it. I'll move closer. What is this? |
| 20 | MR. PAUL: That's a picture of the sports |
| 21 | center across the street from our home. |
| 22 | MR. ELLIOTT: And where do the bleachers |
| 23 | go? |
| 24 | MR. PAUL: The bleachers would go |
| 25 | approximately over here, and I understand slightly |

| 1 | elevated. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MR. ELLIOTT: You're indicating over to |
| 3 | the right? |
| 4 | MR. PAUL: Yes, sir. |
| 5 | MR. ELLIOTT: And this is a view from |
| 6 | where? |
| 7 | MR. PAUL: Directly across the street from |
| 8 | my house and other houses, not just my house. |
| 9 | MR. ELLIOTT: Thank you. |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Mr. |
| 11 | Herzstein, anything? |
| 12 | MR. HERZSTEIN: I also wanted to ask you |
| 13 | to explain pictures one, two, three, and four, if you |
| 14 | could. Where were those taken from and what do they |
| 15 | show? |
| 16 | MR. PAUL: Well, there are three houses, |
| 17 | three primarily houses. I guess 37 my house and |
| 18 | the next three houses down, show this area. |
| 19 | MR. HERZSTEIN: These were from those |
| 20 | houses, is that what you're saying? |
| 21 | MR. PAUL: Yes, sir, they were, that's |
| 22 | correct. |
| 23 | MR. HERZSTEIN: And that's the existing |
| 24 | vegetation, is that correct? |
| 25 | MR. PAUL: Absolutely. |

1 MR. HERZSTEIN: And the same with five and 2 six? 3 MR. PAUL: Absolutely. 4 MR. HERZSTEIN: Thank you. 5 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you very much. 6 HERZSTEIN: Mr. Paul, you 7 attached some historical materials to your exhibit. What was the purpose of that? 8 About Battery Gaines? 9 MR. PAUL: 10 just thought it was interesting. I'm not a historian, but I understand that Battery Gaines was a flanked 11 12 fort, I think protecting the blind side of Fort Reno. None of us knew exactly where it was, and going to 13 the National Archives, and I think there's something 14 15 that's enclosed in your folder there. It shows that 16 the battery itself was where the swimming pool is, 17 actually, on an angle looking towards River Road. The amazing thing about that is, I'll just 18 19 mention this just for your interest. Most of you, I 20 presume, have seen the movie Patton. Do you remember 21 when Patton was standing on top of the mountain and he was looking down and he said, "I was there a thousand 22 It was amazing, when I was 23 years ago." opposite side of the -- actually, looking towards Fort 24

Gaines on the service road there, it looks as if that

1 part of the property was not graded. The natural 2 grade was there. 3 From there, you can almost see through 4 Bethesda. I mean, you can see River Road. You can 5 Apartment buildings. Ιf see the Kenwood those buildings weren't there, you could actually see the 6 7 town of Bethesda. What I think is amazing, and perhaps Mr. 8 9 since you're with the National Capital Park Parsons, Service, or you're involved with that, I wonder if 10 some of those -- where they graded the swimming pool, 11 12 I imagine there's not relics left, but where service road is, that natural elevation, the high peak 13 Ι wonder if maybe there should be 14 15 archeological study to see if there are any relics 16 there that might be of interest to all. 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, we appreciate having that called to our attention by both Mr. Paul 18 19 and Ms. Khoury and having the historical information I believe there is an archeologist 20 shared with us. 21 for the District of Columbia. So, we may be calling Thank you all. 22 on her services. Byrne, Anthony Byrne, 23 Heather William 24 Culver. Are you the Byrnes?

MR. BYRNES: Yes.

1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Culver, is he --2 MR. BYRNES: I believe he left. 3 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Не left, okay. 4 Whenever you're ready. 5 Okay. Madame Chair, members MS. BYRNES: 6 of the Zoning Commission, my name is Heather Jean 7 Byrne, and I reside at 4205 Warren Street, within 200 feet of the Tenley campus. I sent a letter to the 8 9 Zoning Commission on March 29, and I want to speak to 10 this. On April 13, 2000, I attended the ANC 3-E 11 12 meeting at which Mr. Taylor presented AU's campus This presentation focused mainly on the Katzen 13 Arts Center project and the recent acquisition of 14 15 commercial property on Wisconsin Avenue and Van Ness 16 Street. 17 When no mention of plans for the Tenley campus had been made, I asked a question towards the 18 19 end of the presentation. I pointed out that 20 had talked about the proposed Katzen Arts 21 Center and the plans for the commercial property, but 22 he had made no mention of what was proposed for the 23 He replied that Tenley campus. the Semester Washington program was presently on the campus, but 24

numbers were falling, and AU may have to reconsider

this program.

He said there was nothing designed as a replacement program at that moment. He added that there may be some changes to the buildings, that that was the extent of what was in the future for the Tenley campus. Knowing there was an agreement with AU over the use of the Tenley campus, I assumed that any changes to the buildings would be minor renovations. I did not realize that the building changes envisaged were of a major nature involving a three story, 100,000 square foot building with an underground car park for 250 cars.

AU made no attempt to contact anyone who lived within 200 feet of the Tenley campus to discuss this change to the campus. They were in consultation with various groups over the main campus plan. I think because they were consulting with the AU Park Citizens Association, they felt this covered Tenley campus residents.

As Mr. Ruttenberg confirmed this evening, residents within 200 feet of the Tenley campus are not members of the AU Park Citizens Association nor, because of the boundaries of this association, can they become members. Project M was already on the campus plan when Mr. Taylor made his presentation, but

he did not disclose this.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

No effort was made to talk to the neighbors who surround this residential campus in a good faith manner, either immediately after the April 13 ANC 3-E meeting or in the following months. Ιt appears that AU chose to ignore an agreement limiting to the and then attempted changes campus, stealthily accomplish a complete change on the Tenley campus by planning to nearly double the intensity of use.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Mr. Byrne?

MR. BYRNE: Madame Chair and members of the Zoning Commission. I am Anthony Byrne, and I live at 4205 Warren Street, N.W. I'm a member of the Tenley Campus Neighbors Association, which I refer to as TCNA in my testimony. I'll provide some background of the campus from a resident's viewpoint.

Half of the 45 TCNA households either face or look directly into the Tenley campus from 42nd Street, Nebraska Avenue, Street, Yuma and Warren While these households look into the campus, Street. the inhabitants of the campus look out straight into many of our front yards. Project M, being three 200 stories hiqh and 100,000 square feet with

additional residents, would be objectionable for this an other reasons.

TCNA's closeness to the campus is one of the main reasons why, when AU was negotiating to buy the Tenley campus, the May 13, 1986 agreement was negotiated with AU. Among the reasons for protecting this residential area and limiting AU's use of the campus were that the existing buildings are sited in such a way as to afford some degree of privacy to the neighbors and are not too objectionable, but no new buildings were to be built.

Second, the existing conditions in 1986, resulting from the daily movement of large numbers of elementary students in the neighborhood, resulting congested traffic and parking problems, should not be made worse by AU increasing the number of students and staff. The conditions stated in the agreement were not arrived at by chance, but stemmed from the low intensity use of the property by the Immaculata Girls Schools, and the way already had a serious conditions impact on neighborhood. This school provided the upper threshold for intensity of use acceptable to TCNA.

The TCNA needs an operating agreement with AU so that AU deals with TCNA in good faith. The

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 present agreement provides the only means of insuring 2 that ΑU and its students behave reasonably 3 neighbors. As a neighbor over the last 15 years, AU 4 has breached at least five clauses of our agreement. 5 TCNA raised no objections until February 6 of this year. With Project M, it was made clear to us 7 that AU had decided the agreement was no longer in effect and that they did not intend to negotiate any 8 9 changes with us in good faith as promised. 10 In closing, I have forwarded two petitions under covers that are dated March 27, 2001, and I 11 12 wrote on a separate matter on April 4. The first petition, signed by 220 neighbors, provided evidence 13 of our community's objections to AU's proposed project 14 15 M and requested that our agreement be carried forward. The second petition, signed by 37 TCNA 16 17 residents and the Catholic Archdiocese, cited the lack of receipt by TCNA of the BZA notice for the BZA 18 19 December 12, 2000 meeting. There has been no 20 satisfactory explanation for this omission. 21 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Can you summarize 22 now, Mr. Byrne? I've just finished. 23 MR. BYRNE: My letter of April 4 notes that AU failed to post on the Tenley 24

campus the hearing notice sign that's required 15 days

| 1 | prior to that meeting by D.C. regulations. Either of |
|----|--|
| 2 | these notices would have allowed the TCNA to take |
| 3 | timely action to apply for party status to these |
| 4 | hearings. I therefore ask that project M not be |
| 5 | approved by the Zoning Commission. |
| 6 | Thank you. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Any |
| 8 | questions for the Byrnes? Ms. Dwyer? Thank you. Ms. |
| 9 | Hamilton? Ms. Quynn? Mr. Wilson? Oh, Ms. Quynn, |
| 10 | sorry. |
| 11 | MS. QUYNN: Either Mr. or Mrs. Byrne can |
| 12 | answer this. It's just along the same lines that I |
| 13 | asked Mr. Pollock. How long have you lived around the |
| 14 | Tenley campus? |
| 15 | MR. BYRNE: It's just about 18 years. |
| 16 | MS. QUYNN: Eighteen years? |
| 17 | MR. BYRNES: Yes. |
| 18 | MS. QUYNN: Okay, and then can you |
| 19 | elaborate how that area has changed, or if it hasn't |
| 20 | changed during that time? |
| 21 | MS. BYRNES: When we moved in, there were |
| 22 | a lot of, shall I say, more elderly residents, perhaps |
| 23 | people more our age in the neighborhood. When we went |
| 24 | in, we were in our particular area, about the only |
| 25 | couple with young children. The composition has |

changed considerably. There are now a lot of families with young children, and I think there has been a big growth in the development of these children attending the schools, which we see with the constant congestion that seems to arise, especially with the Janne School and the St. Annes School on Yuma Street and the entrance to the Janne School off of Yuma Street there and Albemarle Street with the Janne School at the time.

We've also, I think, seen somewhat more commercialization along Wisconsin Avenue, but I feel that the area still is predominantly a residential area in this way with the sort of charm of the Tenley campus being the treed area and the sort of more parklike area, and especially down the Warren Street side of Tenley campus.

MS. QUYNN: Mr. Byrne, you mentioned the agreement and then the five breaches. Can you describe what you feel those are?

MR. BYRNE: Well, one of the clauses of the agreement, I think it's clause three, is that there are to be no new structures, and in fact, American University has constructed what looks like a small garage or a tool shed on the back of the campus facing 42nd Street.

1 The agreement also has quite clear 2 prohibitions on student vehicles and parking, 3 Warren Street has just become a haven for long-term 4 parking by the students. I don't know how they don't 5 get booked, but there is certainly no policing by the 6 University, and for some reason the D.C. government 7 doesn't book them. There was also a clause, I think clause 8 9 seven, prohibited left-hand turns out onto Yuma Street 10 so that traffic from the University wasn't coming into 11 the neighborhood, and that was upheld for quite a long 12 while, and there was a traffic arm that actually stopped that happening. Within that last year, that 13 was dismantled, so traffic just comes left into the 14 15 neighborhood all the time. 16 There was a clause about cleaning 17 debris and refuse on the campus, and Warren Street has just been a disgrace as it runs down to Nebraska for 18 19 There's just been garbage everywhere. weeks. I think the final breach was the fact that 20 21 we didn't have any discussions or negotiations wherein terminate 22 American University decided to this They did it sort of unilaterally. 23 That's all that I had. 24 MS. QUYNN:

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:

25

Mr.

Thank you.

| 1 | Elliott? |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. ELLIOTT: Is there a population cap |
| 3 | for that campus in the agreement, and was it violated? |
| 4 | MR. BYRNE: There was a population cap, I |
| 5 | think, of 500 students and 450 for accommodation |
| 6 | within that 500. There was, I think, 125 staff, and |
| 7 | 76 parking spaces. I think I've got that right. I |
| 8 | really don't know whether it's been exceeded or not. |
| 9 | American University can probably answer that. |
| 10 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Anything |
| 11 | else, Mr. Elliott? |
| 12 | MR. ELLIOTT: No, thank you. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And Mr. Wilson, did I |
| 14 | skip you over? Okay. Mr. Herzstein? Thank you all. |
| 15 | Now, were there any other persons in |
| 16 | opposition that didn't get their names onto the list? |
| 17 | Come forward, please. Please state your name for the |
| 18 | record. |
| 19 | MR. HAMILTON: The name is Charles |
| 20 | Hamilton. I am surprised that I'm not on the list, |
| 21 | for the simple reason that I filed my intention to |
| 22 | appear the first session when these proceedings began, |
| 23 | and supplied the Commission with 15 copies of my |
| 24 | statement. |

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN:

25

This was just a list

that we had tonight for whoever was present, but please proceed.

MR. HAMILTON: All right. My statement that you have before you of the Washington University St. Louis plan overlay is instructive, and it shows the positive result of long-term attention to planning in an institution located in an urban residential environment similar to that of American University. Two institutions have a similar problem planning for growth and expansion.

One is looking to other sites to meet future academic requirements and one merely thinks in terms of overbuilding without specifics. The community's insistence on a population cap is important, as it sets limits and forces considerations of other options for the future.

AU's request for flexibility is basically a license to do whatever it pleases at the expense of the community. There are no development quidelines mentioned in the proposed plan. Specific building uses such as administrative and academic are too vaque. What is to be intended use, why, and when needed, such factors as mass, siting, windows, design parameters, appearance, and noise reduction, landscaping, and hours of operations are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

missing in some cases.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There is the no assessment on environmental impact, particularly on the construction on a former World War I weapons area. There needs to be a third way with the arts center to get what could be a distinct cultural amenity of value whole community, right. Ιf redesign our relocation of the site is necessary, so be it.

When one looks closely at the mass of the current design, its negative impact on the residential community of Fort Gaines, it's overpowering. That is in addition to the canyon effect which seems to be dismissed. No one has answered the question of why the Nebraska Avenue parking lot site was not considered.

For these reasons, the plan needs to be remanded back to AU for further work. This plan first view by represents the such the Zoning Commission. It affords it an opportunity to encourage the university to get serious and stop wasting the community's time and engage in a constructive effort will be beneficial that to the parties and the District of Columbia at large.

The community achieved its goals in 1989 in a creative manner, and I believe it can do it

| 1 | again. |
|----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. |
| 3 | Hamilton. Please state your name for the record. |
| 4 | MR. ALPHONSO: My name is Joseph Alphonso. |
| 5 | I work for Mr. Elliott. Mr. Elliott asked me to |
| 6 | determine the size of WalMart and K-Mart. I have |
| 7 | measured the WalMart and K-Mart in Manassas on Route |
| 8 | 234. The WalMart building |
| 9 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: What's the relevance |
| 10 | of this? |
| 11 | MR. ELLIOTT: He can just submit it for |
| 12 | the record. |
| 13 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That would be |
| 14 | wonderful. |
| 15 | MR. ELLIOTT: It's at tab 16. |
| 16 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Some of us have to |
| 17 | catch the Metro at midnight, so we really would like |
| 18 | to just get going. |
| 19 | MR. ELLIOTT: It was only 20 seconds |
| 20 | longer, but that's fine. |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: If we could just have |
| 22 | that in writing, that's fine. So we have that. |
| 23 | MR. ELLIOTT: Tab 16, and Madame Chair, |
| 24 | Mr. Hamilton's statement is at tab seven. The full |
| 25 | statement is longer |

| 1 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Any |
|----|---|
| 2 | questions for Mr. Hamilton? Any questions, anybody? |
| 3 | Raise your hand. Okay. |
| 4 | I don't believe we've asked for any |
| 5 | additional information to be submitted, although we |
| 6 | would look forward to getting the testimony of the |
| 7 | students who have conditional support, want to offer |
| 8 | conditional support. Is there anything else that's |
| 9 | open? |
| 10 | SECRETARY BASTIDA: No, there is nothing |
| 11 | else. I just want to remind that the individuals that |
| 12 | are planning to submit any additional information, |
| 13 | that the record probably would be open until the 19th |
| 14 | of April, unless the Commissioners request some |
| 15 | information, and then there would be window of |
| 16 | opportunity with set times to provide that |
| 17 | information. Thank you. |
| 18 | MS. DWYER: Madame Chair, just one |
| 19 | question. The hearing on the 19th will begin with the |
| 20 | cross examination by |
| 21 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Wilson. |
| 22 | MS. DWYER: By Mr. Wilson, followed by his |
| 23 | testimony. |
| 24 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Followed by your |
| 25 | rebuttal. |

| 1 | MS. DWYER: Followed by rebuttal. |
|----|--|
| 2 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. Okay, Mr. |
| 3 | Elliott? |
| 4 | MR. ELLIOTT: I didn't quite follow the |
| 5 | window of opportunity of Mr. Bastida. I'm sorry. |
| 6 | It's late in the day. |
| 7 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: He was saying that |
| 8 | the record will be open until at least the 19th |
| 9 | because we're not done yet, okay? |
| 10 | MR. ELLIOTT: All right. |
| 11 | CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Great. Thank you all |
| 12 | for coming, and thank you for your patience. We will |
| 13 | reconvene this hearing April 19, 7:00 p.m. |
| 14 | (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was |
| 15 | concluded at 11:39 p.m.) |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| | |